

AGENDA

SC Education Oversight Full Committee Meeting

Monday, December 8, 2025

1:00 p.m.

Room 521, Blatt Building

I. Welcome and Introductions April Allen

II. Approval of Full EOC Committee Minutes for
October 13, 2025..... April Allen

III. Special Presentations:
Presentation from the Education Commission of the States (ECS):
Supports & Services by Joel Moore, Director, State Relations

Presentation from 2025 High School Data Trailblazer Award Winner
Tripp Aldredge, Principal, Ft. Dorchester High School (Dorchester Two)

IV. Academic Standards & Assessments Subcommittee Dr. Patty Tate
Information Items:
SC Report Card Release
CTE Data Project Update

Action Items:
Cyclical Review of the SC Social Studies College and Career Ready
Standards Dr. Rainey Knight

2025 Cyclical Review of the Accountability System Dana Yow
(to be posted 12.05.2025) & Laura Pinsonnault, Associate
The Center for Assessment

V. EIA & Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee..... April Allen
Action Item:
2026-27 EIA Budget & Proviso Recommendations
(to be posted 12.05.2025)

VI. Executive Director's Update Dana Yow

VII. Adjournment

April Allen

CHAIR

Brian Newsome

VICE CHAIR

Tammy Achziger

Terry Alexander

Melanie Barton

Russell Baxley

Neal Collins

Bill Hager

Barbara B. Hairfield

Sidney Locke

Jeri McCumbee

Melissa Pender

Patty J. Tate

C. Ross Turner, III

Ellen Weaver

Dana Yow
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Full Committee Meeting

Minutes of the Meeting

October 13, 2025

Members Present (in-person or remote): Rep. Neal Collins, Brian Newsome, Barbara Hairfield, Melissa Pender, Dr. Patty Tate, Sen. Ross Turner, April Allen, Melanie Barton, Rep. Bill Hager, Rep. Terry Alexander, and Jeri McCumbee

Special Guests: Glenview Middle School Principal, Ryan Roberts; Digital Integration Specialist, Ashley Pursley; Math 8 Teacher and Data Analyst, Sarah Dean; and Superintendent (Anderson School District Five), Dr. Brenda Kelly; and Dr. Abbey Duggins, SCDE

EOC Staff Present: Crystal Garcia, Tenell Felder, Amina Asghar, Hope Johnson-Jones, Dr. Rainey Knight, Dr. Matthew Lavery, Dr. Jenny May and Dana Yow

EOC Chair April Allen, opened the full committee meeting and asked for a motion to approve the full committee minutes from the August 11-12, 2025 EOC Retreat meeting. Representative Bill Hager motioned to approve the minutes which was seconded by Representative Neal Collins. After the minutes were approved Allen called forward Glenview Middle School Principal, Ryan Roberts to be recognized as the 2025 Data Trailblazer Middle School. Principal Ray Roberts presented on the school's achievements in using data to improve student outcomes, support families in understanding student progress, promote data-driven decision-making, and maintain strong data privacy practices.

Mr. Roberts highlighted the school's success as a result of strong leadership and data-driven improvement efforts inspired by Superintendent Dr. Brenda Kelly's vision. He credited Dr. Kelly for the district's highest report card results in seven years. Roberts emphasized the importance of combining strong systems and dedicated people, calling education the "ultimate team sport." He shared examples of staff compassion and commitment to students' well-being and growth. Roberts introduced Ashley Pursley, Digital Integration Specialist, and Sarah Dean, Math 8 Teacher and Data Analyst, who contribute to the school's ongoing progress through innovative data use and collaboration.

EOC Member, Melanie Barton commended the team for exemplifying the Governor's "3 Cs" philosophy—cooperation, communication, and collaboration. She presented a letter from the

Governor recognizing their outstanding work and emphasized his belief that “you can’t manage what you don’t measure,” thanking the group for using data to improve teaching and learning.

Next, Dr. Patty Tate, ASA Chair provided an update on the Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee. The ASA subcommittee met on September 15 and reviewed two information items: an update from Mrs. Yow on the Cyclical Review of the Accountability System and an update from Dr. Knight on the Social Studies Standards Review Process. Both full reports will be presented in December. The committee also approved one action item—the Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Instruction—which was presented by Amina Asghar, EOC Data Engineer.

Asghar presented her report on the Evaluation of Alternative Instruction Methods using the 2023–24 Evaluation of Alternative Instruction Methods, which under Proviso 1A.66 analyzed SCREADY (Grades 3–8) and EOCEP (High School) assessment data across instructional types—face-to-face, VirtualSC, district virtual, hybrid, other virtual, out-of-state virtual, and unknown. Across all high school subjects, face-to-face students consistently achieved the highest scores and pass rates, while students in virtual and hybrid formats scored significantly lower. Results showed that students in face-to-face settings consistently outperformed those in virtual or hybrid environments. While prior academic achievement was the strongest predictor of performance, instructional method still had a statistically significant effect. A major limitation was missing data on instructional types, which will need to be addressed in future evaluations.

Representative Collins inquired whether data should be centralized or continue being submitted by schools. Amina Asghar noted confidence in the current data but acknowledged gaps due to missing information. Melanie Barton asked who determines the instructional method, and Asghar explained that districts manually classify each course. Barton highlighted that this manual process could contribute to data collection challenges.

April Allen updated the committee on the EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee report for the 2025–2026 EIA Budget Process, noting that the subcommittee will meet three times this fall. The sole action item, the South Carolina Teacher Loan Program Report, was presented by EOC Consultant Sally Cauthen and no second was required, as the item originated from the subcommittee.

The 2025 TLP Report highlights declining participation, especially in Type 1 loans, despite higher caps and expanded eligibility. Contributing factors include limited awareness, weak marketing, and fewer Teacher Cadet programs. Recommendations focus on improving coordination, modernizing applications, promoting the program, aligning with other incentives, and strengthening retention to better address South Carolina’s educator shortages. Dr. Patty Tate

inquired about improving marketing efforts for better awareness of the program and asked if any funds are allocated for advertising. Ms. Cauthen responded that she is not aware of any money being used specifically for advertising. Melanie Barton questioned whether changes to the program's structure are needed to better attract teachers, citing a 21% decline in education program enrollment over the past decade. She suggested identifying obstacles preventing entry into the classroom and proposed that the committee speak directly with current and prospective teachers to gain insights. Representative Alexander asked about ownership and oversight of the program. Melanie Barton clarified that it is managed by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) in partnership with the Student Loan Corporation. Rep. Alexander recommended that the Student Loan Corporation offer the EOC insights and recommendations on the program's effectiveness. Ms. Yow responded that Ray Jones from the Student Loan Corporation already presents to the EIA subcommittee, as they receive EIA funding, but noted that the budget is approved by the CHE and the program's governance structure is relatively complex.

Dr. Patty Tate moved to accept the TLP report and requested that the EOC chair form a strategic committee to conduct a comprehensive review of relevant statutes, provisos, and regulations. The committee would propose changes, including strategies for the long-term use of the revolving loan fund and other initiatives to recruit high school students into the teaching profession—which was option four presented by Ms. Cauthen. The committee would use the report to make specific recommendations to the EOC by the end of the current fiscal year. Rep. Alexander supported the motion, and Sen. Ross Turner seconded it. The motion carried.

April Allen moved to accept the EIA and Improvement Mechanisms Subcommittee report. Melanie Barton supported the motion, and Rep. Bill Hager seconded it. Following this, Ms. Yow provided the Executive Director Update.

Ms. Yow highlighted several key points. She reported that the EOC and State Board of Education are conducting a joint retreat with support from the University of Georgia's assessment office to clarify the assessment review and approval process. This effort aims to explain how standards and assessments progress through their seven-year cycle, the role of teachers, and the responsibilities of governing bodies, with findings expected in January. She also addressed the "Moonshot Goal," which targets 75% student proficiency by 2030, noting that tentative review dates have been shared with State Board staff, though confirmation is pending. Finally, Ms. Yow stated that the School Report Card release has been delayed to the first week of November due to inconsistencies in high school data, while elementary and middle school data are complete. Ms. Yow clarified that the main issue with the School Report Card data was related to the College

and Career Readiness Indicator and how it was calculated and aggregated. The EOC and State Department agreed to ensure all data are fully accurate before public release, and a specific release date will be communicated once finalized.

Rep. Collins emphasized the critical importance of the School Report Card, noting that teachers, principals, district superintendents, and families rely on it. Rep. Collins expressed frustration that the report, central to the accountability system, is delayed until November, arguing this fails both schools and families by providing information too late to be actionable. Rep. Collins highlighted concerns about inaccurate data, particularly at the high school level, and criticized the system for lacking prioritization, timely preparation, and transparency, which leaves educators anxious about their positions and undermines trust in the accountability process. Rep. Collins stressed that ensuring timely and accurate report card releases should be the Department's top priority. Rep. Alexander asked who is responsible for ensuring schools submit accurate data on time. Ms. Yow stated that responsibility lies with both the State Department of Education and the EOC.

Ms. Yow then provided an update on the December 8 committee agenda, noting it will be full and include the final report of the Cyclical Review of the Accountability System. She mentioned the final Accountability Advisory Committee meeting on December 3, explaining that the report will be provided shortly after, leaving a very tight review window. Additional items on the agenda include EIA improvement recommendations, the Social Studies Standards Review report, the Data Trailblazer Award presentation for a high school winner, and a presentation from the Education Commission of the States.

After this update, the meeting was adjourned.



Raymond J. "Tripp" Aldredge, III

Principal

Fort Dorchester High School

Fort Dorchester High School is a comprehensive high school, serving the easternmost communities of our district over the past 32 years, offering a world-class educational experience that prepares each student for college and/or career success. We currently serve 2,350 students across grades 9-12 in our diverse community of North Charleston, in a rapidly growing area of Dorchester County.

As of 2022, our community of 116,000 residents has an average median income of \$40,000 with an employment rate of approximately 95%. However, 20% of our residents live

below the poverty line, and our school's poverty index stands at 57.5%. Reflecting the diversity of the community, our student population is 43.5% African American, 34.8% Caucasian, 12.5% Hispanic, 3.8% Asian, .26% Hawaiian-Pacific Islander and 5.2% other. This blend of long-time residents, transient citizens, and families from suburban and urban areas contributes to the unique fabric of our school.

Our school and community are committed to helping students achieve their full potential. We have consistently earned an "Excellent" school report card rating since 2019, and our school community firmly believes that prepared, responsible individuals who are determined to excel will succeed. Together, we embrace this shared commitment to excellence in all that we do.

Data Highlights

SC School Report Card: The school has earned an "Excellent" rating each year from 2019 to 2024, with notable growth in key indicators, including graduation rate and college/career readiness.

ELA EOC Data: From 2019 to 2024, the percentage of students earning A's and B's increased, while F grades decreased. The transition from English 1 to English 2 EOC in 2023 may explain some year-to-year changes.

Algebra 1 EOC Data: After a decline in 2020-2022 (affected by COVID-19), Algebra 1 performance improved in 2023 and 2024 with higher passing rates and more students earning C or higher.

Biology EOC Data: Performance in Biology declined from 2019 to 2023 but showed signs of recovery in 2024, with fewer students earning F's and more students achieving A's and B's.

U.S. History EOC Data: U.S. History performance fluctuated, with improvements in 2023 followed by mixed results in 2024, including a rise in F grades and challenges with new state standards.

College and Career Readiness: From 2021 to 2024, both college and career readiness showed strong growth, with career readiness increasing by 8.4% from 2023 to 2024.

Attendance: Attendance improved in 2023-2024, with a 40% reduction in average daily period absences.

Acceleration Opportunities: High-achieving students are provided with enrichment activities, AP courses, and dual credit programs in partnership with local colleges, allowing them to earn college credits while in high school.

Recovery and Growth Plans: A comprehensive recovery program supports students who are below grade level through credit recovery, quarterly recovery plans, and ongoing progress monitoring to ensure academic growth and success.

Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS): MTSS provides a framework for identifying at-risk students and offering personalized academic, behavioral, and emotional support through interventions and regular monitoring to ensure student success.

Equity Initiatives: The school emphasizes equity, offering flexible learning opportunities like Individualized Learning Time (ILT), ensuring all students can participate and thrive.



The School Report Cards are the fourth Report Cards released with ratings since 2019. The two-year pause occurred because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Summary of the Overall Ratings and Indicators

Overall Ratings

- Based on a 100-point scale, per state law

Number and percentage of schools receiving Overall Ratings by school year

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS			HIGH SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	161 (24.1%)	124 (18%)	131 (19%)	70 (20.8%)	43 (12%)	60 (17%)	48 (20.3%)	63 (25%)	76 (30%)
Good	161 (24.1%)	187 (28%)	200 (29%)	97 (28.9%)	87 (25%)	98 (28%)	46 (19.4%)	42 (17%)	55 (22%)
Average	240 (36.0%)	250 (37%)	257 (38%)	134 (39.9%)	158 (46%)	153 (44%)	68 (28.7%)	69 (27%)	75 (30%)
Below Average	80 (12.0%)	86 (13%)	83 (12%)	30 (8.9%)	44 (13%)	9 (13%)	45 (19.0%)	56 (22%)	31 (12%)
Unsatisfactory	25 (3.7%)	25 (4%)	7 (1%)	5 (1.5%)	8 (2%)	2 (2%)	30 (12.7%)	14 (6%)	14 (6%)
Number of Report Cards	667	672	678	336	340	349	237	244	251

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Fifteen schools did not receive Overall Ratings.

Ranges of scores necessary to receive overall Ratings by school type

Overall Rating	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Excellent	61-100	56-100	67-100
Good	53-60	48-55	60-66
Average	42-52	36-47	51-59
Below Average	34-41	29-35	40-50
Unsatisfactory	0-33	0-28	0-39

Indicator Ratings

Academic Achievement: Indicator determines if students in a school are meeting state standards in English Language Arts (Reading and Writing) and Math.

*Counts 35 points for Elementary and Middle Schools; 25 points for High Schools

Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in **Academic Achievement indicator** by school year

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS			HIGH SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	150 (23%)	170 (25%)	201 (30%)	58 (17.3%)	57 (17%)	61 (17%)	19 (8.2%)	21 (9%)	33 (13%)
Good	134 (20%)	140 (21%)	134 (20%)	63 (18.8%)	64 (19%)	71 (20%)	31 (13.3%)	44 (18%)	42 (17%)
Average	227 (34%)	224 (33%)	254 (37%)	123 (36.6%)	128 (37%)	137 (39%)	65 (27.9%)	73 (31%)	85 (34%)
Below Average	123 (18%)	121 (18%)	81 (12%)	72 (21.4%)	74 (21%)	67 (19%)	73 (31.3%)	74 (31%)	54 (22%)
Unsatisfactory	33 (5%)	17 (3%)	8 (1%)	20 (6.0%)	17 (5%)	13 (4%)	45 (19.3%)	27 (11%)	34 (14%)
Number of Report Cards	667	672	678	336	340	349	233	239	251

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Eighteen schools did not receive Academic Achievement indicator Ratings.

Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on SC READY by school year State Performance (Elementary and Middle Schools)

English Language Arts

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
42.4%	46.8%	52.7%	54.1%	60.3%

Mathematics

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
37.0%	38.8%	39.6%	42.8%	44.5%

**Percent Earning a C or better on End-of-Course exams by school year
State Performance (High Schools)**

English 2

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
67.4%	66.84%	67.4%	66.4%	68.5%

Algebra I

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
34.6%	42.3%	44.86%	47.8%	51.6%

Preparing for Success*: This indicator determines if students in a school are meeting state standards in Science (as measured by SC READY Science given in 4th and 6th grades) in Elementary Middle Schools. For High Schools, the indicator measures performance on both the Biology I and U.S. History and the Constitution End-of-Course exams.

*Preparing for Success *was not* calculated or reported for elementary and middle schools for the 2024 Report Cards to allow scoring for the new SC READY Science test to be developed.

10 points for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools

**Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in
Preparing for Success by school year**

	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS			HIGH SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	71 (11%)	—	74 (11%)	22 (7%)	—	29 (9%)	9 (3.9%)	17 (7%)	17 (7%)
Good	76 (12%)	—	88 (13%)	28 (9%)	—	44 (14%)	12 (5.2%)	11 (5%)	14 (6%)
Average	174 (27%)	—	189 (29%)	70 (23%)	—	90 (28%)	59 (25.3%)	66 (26%)	71 (28%)
Below Average	144 (22%)	—	168 (26%)	79 (26%)	—	85 (27%)	73 (31.3%)	79 (34%)	82 (33%)
Unsatisfactory	178 (28%)	—	134 (21%)	106 (35%)	—	68 (22%)	80 (34.3%)	61 (26%)	66 (26%)
Number of Report Cards	643	—	678	305	—	349	233	234	250

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Seventy-four schools did not receive Preparing for Success indicator Ratings.

**Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on SC READY/PASS Science by school year
State Performance (Elementary and Middle Schools)**

Science

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
42.9%	46.0%	43.7%	Not measured .	49.5%

**Percent Earning a C or better on End-of-Course exams by school year
State Performance (High Schools)**

Biology I

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
39.3%	42.6%	42.9%	47.9%	44.0%

U.S. History and the Constitution

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
37.1%	39.3%	44.67%	41.5%	45.7%

Student Progress: This indicator determines how students are growing or improving academically in ELA and Math and how the lowest performing 20% of students in a school are growing academically.

*Counts 35 points for Elementary and Middle Schools; does not count for High Schools

*Scoring assumes there are 20 or more Multilingual Learners in a school.

**Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in
Student Progress indicator by school year**

St Prog. Rating	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	84 (13%)	75 (11%)	81 (12%)	20 (6.0%)	22 (6%)	57 (16%)
Good	157 (24%)	145 (22%)	185 (28%)	76 (22.6%)	52 (15%)	83 (24%)
Average	245 (37%)	307 (46%)	279 (42%)	182 (54.2%)	143 (42%)	132 (38%)
Below Average	140 (21%)	109 (16%)	94 (14%)	53 (15.8%)	91 (27%)	54 (16%)
Unsatisfactory	37 (6%)	33 (5%)	31 (5%)	5 (1.5%)	32 (9%)	22 (6%)
# of Cards	663	669	670	336	340	348

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Twenty elementary and middle schools did not receive Preparing for Success indicator Ratings.

Multilingual Learners' Proficiency: Indicator determines if students in a school who are non-native-English speakers are meeting growth targets to learn the English Language.

*Counts 10 points for all schools with 20 or more Multilingual Learners.

**Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in
Multilingual Learners' Progress indicator by school year**

MLP Rating	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS			HIGH SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	49 (13%)	8 (1%)	6 (2%)	11 (6%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	— (0%)
Good	167 (44%)	63 (18%)	56 (16%)	57 (31%)	11 (6%)	14 (8%)	36 (25%)	10 (7%)	10 (7%)
Average	127 (34%)	160 (46%)	168 (47%)	73 (40%)	48 (27%)	43 (25%)	66 (46%)	35 (25%)	38 (27%)
Below Average	31 (8%)	107 (31%)	122 (34%)	41 (22%)	83 (47%)	91 (53%)	38 (26%)	74 (52%)	77 (55%)
Unsatis- factory	0 (0%)	10 (3%)	6 (2%)	2 (1%)	31 (18%)	24 (14%)	3 (2%)	22 (15%)	16 (11%)
# of Cards	374	348	358	184	175	173	144	142	141

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. 621 schools without 20 or more Multilingual Learners did not receive ratings for this indicator.

School Climate: Indicator uses results from the Teacher and Student Climate surveys to measure perceptions of safety, working conditions, instructional focus, and social-physical environment.

*Counts 10 points for Elementary and Middle Schools; 5 points for High Schools

Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in **School Climate Indicator**

Sch Clim. Rating	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			MIDDLE SCHOOLS			HIGH SCHOOLS		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	135 (20%)	162 (24%)	159 (23%)	44 (13%)	71 (21%)	77 (22%)	31 (13%)	50 (20%)	58 (23%)
Good	128 (19%)	137 (20%)	145 (21%)	84 (25%)	91 (27%)	89 (26%)	41 (17%)	57 (23%)	51 (20%)
Average	212 (32%)	215 (32%)	222 (33%)	109 (32%)	127 (37%)	133 (38%)	78 (32%)	93 (38%)	98 (39%)
Below Average	123 (18%)	109 (16%)	113 (17%)	57 (17%)	42 (12%)	37 (11%)	53 (22%)	35 (14%)	37 (15%)
Unsatis- factory	70 (11%)	49 (7%)	40 (6%)	43 (13%)	9 (3%)	11 (3%)	38 (16%)	11 (4%)	9 (4%)
# of Cards	668	672	679	337	340	347	241	246	253

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. For this indicator, 14 schools did not receive a rating.

High School Student Success: This indicator shows if high school students have earned the required 24 credits (four in English and four in math) to be eligible for graduation in four years OR shows if students have reached a successful high school outcome within five years of beginning high school.

Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in **High School Student Success** by school year

High School Student Success	2024	2025
Excellent	69 (28%)	78 (31%)
Good	72 (29%)	103 (41%)
Average	59 (24%)	45 (18%)
Below Average	27 (11%)	13 (5%)
Unsatisfactory	18 (7%)	11 (5%)
Number of Cards	245	252

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Three high schools were not rated for this indicator in 2025.

Graduation Rate: Indicator determines what percentage of students who entered the high school in the 9th grade graduated in at least 4 years.

*Counts 19 points for High Schools only.

**Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in
Graduation Rate indicator by school year**

Graduation Rate Rating	High Schools			
	2022	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	77 (32.1%)	79 (33.3%)	84 (35%)	111 (44%)
Good	82 (34.2%)	81 (34.2%)	73 (30%)	79 (32%)
Average	54 (22.5%)	48 (20.3%)	61 (25%)	39 (16%)
Below Average	14 (5.8%)	17 (7.2%)	16 (7%)	10 (4%)
Unsatisfactory	13 (5.4%)	12 (5.1%)	8 (3%)	8 (3%)
Number of Cards	240	237	242	242

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Eight high schools were not rated for this indicator in 2025.

State Graduation Rate

2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
82.6%	84.6%	81.0%	81.1%	82.2%	83.3%	83.8%	83.8%	85.4%	86.7

College and Career Ready: Indicator determines if students who are graduating from a high school are prepared for college or careers after graduating.

*Counts 25 points for High Schools only.

**Number and percentage of schools receiving ratings in
College and Career Ready indicator by school year**

CCR Rating	High Schools		
	2023	2024	2025
Excellent	46 (19%)	85 (35%)	114 (46%)
Good	60 (25%)	68 (28%)	71 (29%)
Average	86 (36%)	66 (27%)	53 (21%)
Below Average	34 (14%)	17 (7%)	3 (1%)
Unsatisfactory	11 (5%)	6 (2%)	6 (2%)
Number of Cards	237	242	247

Note: Totals do not include Career Centers or Special Schools. Eight high schools were not rated for this indicator.

Percent of Students College OR Career Ready

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
61.1%	65.8%	64.7%	71.5%	75.1%

*Students can be counted more than once as they may meet more than one option.

Percent of Students College AND Career Ready

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
28.7%	29.0%	29.3%	30.6%	31.2%

Percent of Students Career Ready

2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2023-24	2024-25
61.1%	55.7%	62.8%	69.6%	73.3%

Career Ready Detail

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
CTE completer with certification	13.8%	17.5%	20.6%	25.1%	28.9%
Work-based learning	3.1%	5.3%	7.7%	9.7%	11.0%
Level 3 or higher on Career Readiness assessment	48.0%	54.1%	47.8%	55.1%	54.9%
ASVAB	6.7%	5.9%	6.9%	9.0%	10.6%
SC High School Employability Credential	Not yet implemented	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%

Percent of Students College Ready

2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
34.1%	32.0%	32.6%	32.5%	33.0%

College Ready Detail

CR Measure	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
ACT: 20 or higher	15.4%	11.3%	11.8%	12.4%	10.2%
SAT: 1020 or higher	20.5%	20.5%	20.0%	19.3%	20.0%
AP: 3 or higher	16.0%	14.9%	15.1%	14.9%	15.7%
IB: 4 or higher	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%
Dual Credit: C or better	15.3%	14.1%	15.2%	15.8%	17.5%
Cambridge C or better	Not yet implemented	0.04%	0.04%	0.03%	0.11%

Academic Achievement & Student Progress Drive SC School Report Card Gains



Mon, 11/03/2025

COLUMBIA, S.C. – Rising test scores, student academic growth, and gains in college- and career- readiness fueled improvements across South Carolina schools according to the 2025 South Carolina School Report Cards, released Monday by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) and South Carolina Education Oversight Committee (EOC).

The new report cards, unveiled at Annie Burnside Elementary School in Richland School District One, measure schools across key performance indicators, including academic achievement, student progress, college and career readiness, and school climate.

The number of South Carolina schools earning an overall rating of ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’ increased from 549 to 623.

Why It Matters:

South Carolina’s School Report Cards provide families, educators, and the community with a clear snapshot of how schools are performing, helping everyone stay informed and engaged on how their schools stack up.

They also provide a roadmap toward the state’s goal for every child to graduate college, career, or military ready, and that by 2030, at least 75% of students at or above grade level.

The Big Picture:

These report cards serve as an important accountability measure, allowing parents, educators, and policy makers to understand and identify challenges in their schools. Schools are rated: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, Unsatisfactory.

Elementary Schools

- Nearly half of SC's elementary schools are rated Good or better.
- More than a quarter of SC elementary schools improved their Overall rating from 2024 to 2025.
- The percentage of elementary schools earning a Good or better on the 'Academic Achievement' and 'Student Progress' indicators rating increased 3% and 7% respectively over 2024.

Middle Schools

- The percentage of middle schools earning a Good or better for the 'Student Progress' indicator rating increased from 22% in 2024 to 40% in 2025.
- Nearly one in three middle schools improved their overall ratings from 2024 to 2025.

High Schools

- South Carolina's On-Time Graduation Rate is at 86.7%, a 10-year high.
- The percentage of high schools earning a Good or better on the 'College/Career Readiness' indicator increased from 63% in 2024 to 75% in 2025.

Spotlight - Annie Burnside Elementary:

Annie Burnside Elementary School earned an overall report card rating of **Excellent** for the 2024-25 school year. This marked an improvement from an Average overall rating in 2023-24.

- Annie Burnside Elementary is one of the EOC's [Beating the Odds Investigative Study Schools](#). Schools in this study are high poverty schools demonstrating strong academic achievement.
- 83% of students at Annie Burnside are considered Pupils in Poverty.
- The 'Student Progress' indicator at Annie Burnside improved from Average in 2023-24 to Excellent in 2024-25.

Looking Ahead:

College and Career Readiness remains a top priority for South Carolina students. While South Carolina's on-time graduation rate is at a ten-year high, only 75.1% of students are either career or college ready. While the gap between the state's graduation rate and college or career readiness has narrowed, more work must be done to ensure that a South Carolina diploma directly translates to post-secondary success.

The recent approval of [South Carolina's tiered stackable credential system](#) is one big step forward to increase alignment of high school credentials with employability. South Carolina's business and industry leaders will have a primary role in developing and maintaining the list of credentials. This tiered system is expected to be fully implemented by the 2027-2028 school year, allowing districts and high schools adequate time to transition to the new system.

What They're Saying:

"These report cards tell a clear story: South Carolina students and educators are rolling up their sleeves and getting results," said **State Superintendent of Education Ellen Weaver**. "From the Lowcountry to the Upstate, we're proving that when teachers are empowered, communities are engaged, and high expectations meet strong support students soar. The South Carolina Surge is growing, and together—from the classroom to the Statehouse—we're building the foundation for every child to reach their God-given potential. This progress is fuel in the tank: energy and inspiration to drive us forward in the vital work still ahead."

"Our state report cards show that South Carolina's on-time graduation rate for high school students remains high at 86.7%. This is great news, but we also acknowledge the need for an increase in students who are college and career ready," said **EOC Chair April Allen**. "With this goal in mind, we are happy to acknowledge the recent approval of the SC tiered credential system. We expect this new system will better prepare our high school students for successful career paths as it is implemented in the upcoming years."

"This 'Excellent' rating belongs to our entire Annie Burnside family. It reflects the hard work of our students, the dedication of our teachers, the support from the community, and their belief in what's possible," said **Dr. Janet Campbell, principal of Annie Burnside Elementary School**. "Our school made a commitment to work together, focus on growth, and hold high expectations for every child. Seeing our students rise to the challenge has been incredibly rewarding."

"What is happening at Annie Burnside proves that success is possible when a school community shares a clear vision and works together to make it real," said **Dr. Todd Walker, Superintendent of Richland School District One**. "I am incredibly proud of Dr. Campbell,

her dedicated staff, and their students, and I am confident that the same determination and collaboration can transform every school in Richland One moving forward.”

More detailed information on the 2025 SC School Report Cards can be found at www.screportcards.com.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DATE: December 8, 2025

ACTION ITEM

Cyclical Review of South Carolina 2019 College and Career Social Studies Standards

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

SECTION 59-18-350. Cyclical review of state standards and assessments; analysis of assessment results.

(A) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Education Oversight Committee, shall provide for a cyclical review by academic area of the state standards and assessments to ensure that the standards and assessments are maintaining high expectations for learning and teaching. At a minimum, each academic area should be reviewed and updated every seven years. After each academic area is reviewed, a report on the recommended revisions must be presented to the Education Oversight Committee and the State Board of Education for consideration. The previous content standards shall remain in effect until the recommended revisions are adopted pursuant to Section 59-18-355. As a part of the review, a task force of parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators, to include special education teachers, shall examine the standards and assessment system to determine rigor and relevancy.

CRITICAL FACTS

Attached is a report that includes recommendations for modifications to the South Carolina College and-Career Ready Social Studies Standards. These recommendations were compiled under the advisement of two review panels: a national review panel of social studies educators who have worked with national or other state organizations and a state review panel made up of South Carolina social studies teachers, parents, business and community leaders and South Carolina teachers of English language learners and exceptional education drawn from various geographic areas in South Carolina.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

April, 2025	Letters of Agreement sent to National Review Panel
April, 2025	Cyclical Review Nominee Forms emailed to SC Leaders for State Review Panel
July, 2025	National Review Panel Conference Call
May, 2025	Selection of SC Review State Panel
September 8, 2025	National Review Panel submitted recommendations
September 22, 2025	Meeting 1 State Review Panel
October 6, 2025	Meeting 2 State Review Panel
October 20, 2025	Meeting 3 State Review Panel; Findings Submitted
November 17, 2025	ASA Approved Recommendations

ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC

Cost: None

Fund/Source: NA

ACTION REQUEST

☒ **For approval**

☐ **For information**

ACTION TAKEN

☐ **Approved**
☐ **Not Approved**

☐ **Amended**
☐ **Action deferred (explain)**

Prepared by Dr. Rainey Knight

For presentation to the Education Oversight Committee

December 8, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The South Carolina Education Accountability Act of 1998 establishes an accountability system for public education that focuses on improving teaching and learning so that students are equipped with a strong foundation in the four primary academic disciplines and a strong belief in lifelong learning. Academic standards are used to focus schools and districts toward higher performance by aligning the state assessment to those standards. The implementation of quality standards in classrooms across South Carolina is dependent upon systematic review of adopted standards, focused teacher development, strong instructional practices, and a high level of student engagement. Pursuant to Section 59-18-350(A) of the Education Accountability Act, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) and the State Board of Education are responsible for reviewing South Carolina's standards and assessments to ensure that high expectations for teaching and learning are being maintained.

The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Education Oversight Committee, shall provide for a cyclical review by academic area of the state standards and assessments to ensure that the standards and assessments are maintaining high expectations for learning and teaching. At a minimum, each academic area should be reviewed and updated every seven years. After each academic area is reviewed, a report on the recommended revisions must be presented to the Education Oversight Committee and the State Board of Education for consideration. After approval by the Education Oversight Committee and the State Board of Education, the recommendations may be implemented. However, the previous content standards shall remain in effect until approval has been given by both entities. As a part of the review, a task force of parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators, to include special education teachers, shall examine the standards and assessment system to determine rigor and relevancy.

In October of 2025, the responsibilities of the EOC under the cyclical review of the South Carolina College and Career Social Studies Standards was completed. A timeline for the process is provided in appendix A.

This report presents recommendations for modifications to the 2019 South Carolina College and Career Ready Social Studies Academic Standards from the Education Oversight Committee. These recommendations were compiled under the advisement of two review teams: a national review team of social studies educators who have worked with national or other state organizations and a state review team of South Carolina teachers, parents, business, higher education, community leaders and faculty from higher education drawn from various geographical areas in South Carolina.

It is important to note that the adopted South Carolina College and Career Social Studies Standards represent the work of many educators, and that this review of the standards was undertaken to identify ways in which their work could be strengthened and supported. The Education Oversight Committee expresses its appreciation to those educators and commends their utilization of national source documents and their belief in the achievement of all students.

The Education Oversight Committee intends to ensure that all students are knowledgeable and capable.

I: CYCLICAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP

This cyclical review of the 2019 South Carolina Social Studies College and Career Standards was conducted beginning May 2025 through October 2025. Both a national review panel and a state review panel were used in seeking recommendations to the current social studies standards.

National Review Panel

The national review panel members consisted of recognized leaders in social studies education who are well versed in national and state social studies standards. Comments and recommendations included in this document are based in part on South Carolina legislation related to social studies, *College, Career and Civic Life C3 Framework* for social studies standards (NCSS, 2013), national standards for history, geography, civics and government and economics, financial literacy standards for South Carolina, the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate, and social studies standards from various states. In addition, the national committee members used their expertise in social studies and their understanding of expectations for student learning. Members of the national team received materials for the review in May 2025. A Zoom meeting was held in July 2025 to provide an opportunity for the national team to share their perspectives on social studies education on a national level. After an independent review period, the members of the panel submitted his/her set of findings via individual final reports. Members of the National Review Panel included:

- Dr. Walter Edgar, Retired Professor Emeritus, University of South Carolina
- Dr. Felice Knight, Director of Education, International African American Museum
- Dr. Wilfred McClay, Victor Davis Hanson Chairman, Classical History and Western Civilization, Hillsdale College
- Ms. Stephanie Nickles, Elementary teacher, Gorham, Maine
- Dr. Robert Pondiscio, Senior Fellow, American Enterprise Institute
- Mr. Gerald Robinson, Professor, University of Virginia
- Mr. Anton Schulzki, Interim Executive Director, National Council on Social Studies

Note: Dr. McClay did not submit a final report.

State Review Panel

Legislators, EOC members, state education board members, superintendents and instructional leaders in districts were invited to recommend members of their respective communities to serve as members of the Social Studies State Cyclical Review Panel. The panel represented teachers, parents, business and community leaders and higher education. Thirty-four individuals

participated in the cyclical review process. Panel members participated in three days of social studies review in September and October. The review panel reached consensus on insights and specific recommendations about the 2019 South Carolina College and Career Social Studies Academic Standards. Members of the State Cyclical Review Panel included:

Claudia Aldamuy, community member, Communities in Schools
Rev Matt Altman, Pastor, North Charleston
Jill Ard, Social Studies teacher, Hanna Pamplico, Florence 2
Brijesh Bala, Special Education Teacher, Calhoun County School District
Timmerial Barnette, Teacher, Chester School District
Teresa Cole, Teacher, Florence 1
William Davis, Teacher, St Matthews Middle School, Calhoun
J R Fennell, community member, Lexington County Museum
Paige Garrett, Teacher, Glenview Middle School, Anderson 5
Frank Gause, Call Me Mister, Coastal Carolina, Conway
Dr. Margaret Wilson Gilliken, Professor, Winthrop, Rock Hill
Rev, Merritt Graves, Pastor, Florence
Keith Grybowski, Charleston County School District School Board member
Timothy Hicks, Teacher, Richland School District Two
Derrick Hines, K12, Teaching Fellows Coordinator, USC, Columbia
Darnell Holland, K-12, Commission on Higher Education, Columbia
Barbara Hunter, Ballentine Elementary, Lexington/Richland Five
Elizabeth Long, School Library Media Specialist, Doby's Mill Elementary, Kershaw CSD
Nancy Lingle, Berry Smalls, Spartanburg 5
Dr. George Liscomb, Professor, Furman University, Greenville
Corey Johnson, Teacher, Kershaw County School District
Patrick Kelly, Teacher, Blythewood High School, Richland 2
Bryan Lynip, Teacher, Meadowfield Elementary, Richland One
Sarah Ostergaard, SC Economics, Darla Moore School Business, Columbia
Darla Moore, Interventionist, Flat Rock Elementary, Anderson School District Three
Madison Hutto Muller, W G Sanders, Richland One
Austin Myers, Teacher, Muller Road Middle School, Richland Two
Julie Parsons, Teacher, Flatrock Elementary, Anderson Three
Shayla Royal, Parent, Florence One
Valerie Sawyer, Teacher, Darlington CSD
Jordan Walker-Reyes, Teacher, Lexington 1
Stephanie Streetman, Parent, Anderson !
Rev. Kevin Taylor, Pastor, Chester
Braden Wilson, Teacher, Palmetto Middle, Williamston

In addition to members of the state committee, additional feedback from teachers was obtained via a survey sent to teachers across the state as recommended from the committee and members of the South Carolina Social Studies Supervisors.

Additional individuals from the South Carolina Department of Education were present to participate as observers and to offer their expertise as needed.

Dr. Kristi Austin, Director, Office of Assessment and Standards
Josh Black, Assistant Director, Office Assessment and Standards
Sandra Ammons, Team Lead, Office of Assessment and Standards
Shelley Britt, Social Studies Test Development
John Katorkas, Secondary Social Studies
Reece Spradley, Elementary Social Studies

B. CRITERIA DESCRIPTIONS TO REVIEW STANDARDS

The SC Social Studies Academic Standards Review Process conducted by the two review teams emphasized the application of the criteria addressing comprehensiveness/balance, rigor, and organization/communication. The South Carolina Department of Education representatives, district and university curriculum leaders, and EOC staff collaborated to identify the standards review criteria. The Standard Operating Procedures for the Review of Standards (SOP) agreed upon by the State Department of Education (SDE) and the EOC during the summer 2003 were followed for this review. Decisions on the criteria to be used were based on a comprehensive review of professional literature, and the goals for the standards review as specified in the Education Accountability Act of 1998.

CRITERION ONE: COMPREHENSIVENESS/BALANCE

The criterion category for Comprehensiveness/Balance is concerned with how helpful the South Carolina Academic Standards document is to educators in designing a coherent curriculum. The criterion is directed at finding evidence that the standards document clearly communicates what constitutes social studies content, that is, what all students should know and be able to do in social studies by the time they graduate. The criterion includes consideration of the following areas:

- The standards address essential content and skills of social studies;
- The standards are aligned across grades as appropriate for content and skills;
- The standards have an appropriate balance of the content and skills needed for mastery of each area; and
- The standards reflect diversity (especially for ethnicity and gender) as appropriate for the subject area.
- The number and scope of the standards for each grade level should be realistic for teaching, learning, and student mastery within the academic year.

CRITERION TWO: RIGOR

This criterion calls for standards that require students to use thinking and problem-solving skills that go beyond knowledge and comprehension. Standards meeting this criterion require students to perform at both national and international benchmark levels

- Standards should focus on cognitive content and skills (not affect);
- Standards should be developmentally appropriate for the grade level;
- Standards should include a sufficient number of standards that require application of learning (application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation);
- Standards should be informed by the content and skills in national and international standards; and,
- Standards should be written at a level of specificity that would best inform instruction for each grade level.

CRITERION THREE: ORGANIZATION/COMMUNICATION

The Organization/Communication criterion category stipulates that the expectations for students are to be clearly written and organized in a manner understandable to all audiences and by teachers, curriculum developers, and assessment writers. Organization includes the following components:

- The content and skills in the standards should be organized in a way that is easy for teachers to understand and follow;
- The format and wording should be consistent across grades;
- The expectations for student learning should be clearly and precisely stated for each grade; and,
- The standards should use the appropriate terminology of the field but be as jargon free as possible.
- The content and skills presented in the standards should be assessable (are observable and demonstrable).

C. MEASURABLE OUTCOMES FOR SOCIAL STUDIES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The only statewide assessment in social studies that occurs in South Carolina schools is the End-of-Course exam that follows the U.S. History and the Constitution course. Although Social Studies in elementary and middle grades pursuant to Section 59-18-325, that testing has been suspended via budget proviso since the 2019-20 Appropriations Act.

The U.S. History and the Constitution End-of-Course test results over the past five years are shown below.

End of Course U.S. History and Constitution

Year	Percent Students Scoring A, B and C	Percent Students Scoring F
2025	48%	39%
2024	44%	41%
2023	45%	39%
2022	39%	44%
2021	37%	42%

D. THE 2019 SOCIAL STUDIES COLLEGE AND CAREER STANDARDS DOCUMENT

The 2019 South Carolina Social Studies College and Career Ready Standards are organized by descriptive themes that focus on the grade level/course around a topic of study. The standards provide a basis for the development of local curricular for teachers and for statewide assessment in US History and Constitution. The academic standards describe for each grade level/high school course the specific areas for student learning that are considered the most important for proficiency in a discipline. The social studies standards focus on four core disciplines of civics, economics, geography and history.

Grades kindergarten through two are similar to other state approaches where there is an introduction to social studies through a disciplinary content focus of history, government, geography and economics. Grade three focuses on world geography.

Grades four and five focus on United States History from the involvement and perspective of South Carolina. Grades six and seven focus on world civilizations and geography and grade eight focuses on the history of South Carolina.

High school social studies standards are arranged by courses. Students are required to enroll and successfully complete three courses (two credits) for graduation: United States History and

Constitution, United States Government and Economics. See Table 1 for the listing of descriptive themes.

Table 1. Descriptive Themes for the 2019 South Carolina College and Career Social Studies Standards

Grades K-Five	
Kindergarten	The Community Around Us
Grade One	Life in South Carolina
Grade Two	Life in the United States
Grade Three	World Geography
Grade Four	United States and South Carolina Studies Part I
Grade Five	United States and South Carolina Studies Part II
Grade Six-Eight	
Grade Six	World Civilizations
Grade Seven	Geography of World Regions
Grade Eight	South Carolina and the United States
High School Standards for Social Studies	
Elective	Human Geography
Elective	Modern World History
Elective	Teaching the History and Literature of Old Testament Era
Elective	Teaching the History and Literature of the New Testament Era
Required	United States History and Constitution (1 unit)
Required	Economics and Personal Finance (0.5 unit)
Required	United States Government (0.5 unit)

In the standards document, there is an overview describing specific subject matter and themes, which is provided on a cover page for each grade level or high school course. The grade level standards are further broken down into:

- Academic standards that serve as the central learning expectations for student learning.
- Enduring understandings that frame the goal of the academic standard.
- Indicators that further breakdown the academic standard into specific knowledge and skills.

The standards document includes a skills progression for history in grade one and grade two to include comparison, causation, change and evidence. Geography skills are included for grade one and two to include maps, evidence and communication and connections. Economic and government skills are included for grades kindergarten through grade two described as relationships, interpretation, communication and informed participation. Vertical historical thinking skills are in grades four through eight and in the history courses in high school and include comparison, causation, periodization, content, change and evidence. Geography skills progression is in grades three, seven, and high school include mapping, models, evidence, connections, scale, and patterns.

Table 2 shows by grade level the themes, number of standards, enduring understandings and indicators.

Table 2. Numeric Summary of the grade level academic standards, Enduring Understandings, Indicators by grade level

		Academic Standards	Enduring Understanding	Indicators
Kindergarten	The Community Around US	4	4	14
Grade One	Life in South Carolina	4	4	15
Grade Two	Life in the United States	4	4	15
Grade Three	World Geography	5	5	16
Grade Four	United States and South Carolina Part 1	5	5	30
Grade Five	United States and South Carolina Part II	5	5	29
Grade Six	World Civilizations	5	6	30
Grade Seven	Geography of World Regions	7	7	36
Grade Eight	South Carolina and the United States	5	5	27
Elective	Human Geography	5	5	30
Elective	Modern World History	8	8	30
Elective	Teaching History and Literature of the Old Testament Era	3	3	14

		Academic Standards	Enduring Understanding	Indicators
Elective	Teaching History and Literature of the New Testament Era	3	3	15
Required	United States History and Constitution	5	5	30
Required	Economics and Personal Finance	4	4	16
Required	United States Government	4	4	16

III: FINDINGS

The discussion below summarizes reviews of the national and state panel members and presents recommendations for considerations by the Education Oversight Committee.

A. Commendations from State and National Panels

1. The alignment guides are more concise, specific and more easily understood than the standards themselves.
2. Overall, the content is appropriate.
3. The introduction of civics and government in the early grades is essential for inculcating values about civic participation.
4. South Carolina and United States history content is rich and complex.
5. The standards are informed by content and skills in national standards, especially in history.
6. Standards reflect many of the ideas encouraged by national professional groups.
7. The format of the social studies standards is consistent across grade levels.
8. The standards represent a skill-centered and inquiry-based framework.

B. Concerns expressed by State Committee Subgroups

Elementary Concerns

1. The standards should be more explicit and leaves too much for interpretation.
2. Teachers should be provided specific examples in a bulleted form such as in the Louisiana standards.
3. Elementary standards should be presented in a more logical format allowing for the progression of scaffolding information from part to whole in preparation for later grade level standards. An example is shown below.

Grade Three	South Carolina History	European Colonization to Civil War	Integrate geography ¹
Grade Four	United State History	American Revolution to Reconstruction	Integrate geography ¹
Grade Five	World History	Reconstruction to Present Day	Integrate geography ¹

Note 1: As regions are taught in South Carolina, the United States and the World, appropriate geography concepts and skills should be integrated.

4. The standards should revert to teaching South Carolina History in grade 3. This aligns with peer states teaching its state's history such as Louisiana and Virginia.
5. By moving grade 3 to South Carolina History, it will provide a clear progression from kindergarten through grade 2 and reinforces a student's identity and connection from family, community to state. This process will also allow a vertical progression to middle school.
6. To help parents and teachers, alignment guides and standards should be placed together on the website making it easier to access and more user-friendly.
7. Introduce United States and South Carolina symbols in grades 1 through 4.
8. Foundational skills should be taught in the early grades and then move to identifying similarities and differences.
9. Elementary grades should be encouraged to use digital sources.

Note: To ensure the elementary subgroup review was seen in its entirety, the work documents were shared with the SC Department of Education

Middle School Concerns

1. World History should be split between sixth and seventh grades; there is far more content in the current course to be taught in one grade.
2. Grade six World Civilizations should cover ancient civilizations through the age of exploration and seventh grade from the age of explorations to the present. Geography skills should be added in both grades so there is a separate strand for geography. If the course is not split, then geography skills should be added to sixth grade course.
3. The standards should list specific content. Providing examples in various standards should provide more direction and guidance to teachers.
4. There is a lack of diversity in gender, ethnicity and among persons with disabilities. There is little mention of Native Americans, African Americans, gender or Gullah Geechee. The topic of diversity is dealt with unevenly and sometimes superficially throughout the standards.
5. Inquiry skills should be developed for each grade level.
6. There should be scaffolding of standards across grade levels.
7. Consider adding another column in the standards document with suggested content, which would provide more clarity, direction and diversity to the indicators and better define for teachers what is expected to be taught.
8. Standards should better focus on a global perspective. Students should have greater exposure to global events, past and present.
9. Add a hyperlink in the standards to the alignment guide for greater usage.
10. Each indicator should stand on its own and not need further clarification.
11. A separate geography strand should be added to grade eight SC History so that students are familiar with the basic geography of the state and its importance to the development of the state.

Note: To ensure the middle school subgroup review was seen in its entirety, the document was shared with the SC Department of Education. Appendix B shows examples of the middle school document.

High School Concerns

1. Clarifying statements should be eliminated because they are not reflective of the indicators and excessively broad.
2. The alignment guides appear to be very useful to teachers. The existence of the standards and the alignment guides can be confusing and cumbersome to teachers. Greater alignment between the two documents would prove to be beneficial to teachers. The suggestion was to look at Kentucky's social studies standards.
3. It was suggested for history standards to be organized chronologically. The College, Career and Civics Life (C3) Framework might be a starting point.
4. Concerns about general school practices such as use of grade floors, no homework, no zeros, school attendance, etc. make it more difficult to ensure students have mastered the scope and depth of the standards, especially in history.
5. For U.S. History and Constitution's End of Course, a document with recommended sources would be very useful such as the Federalists papers, specific SCOTUS opinions, etc. In addition, released test items would be helpful in giving teachers more insight into how to prepare students for the end of course assessment. (For example, New York Regents exam does this.)
6. Teachers should have access to primary sources for all history classes. The Learning Objective Repository (LOR) would be a site for such documents.
7. The state should develop standards for elective courses (in addition to the current high school course standards) in World History (1200 to present), Human Geography and Current Events, Digital and Media Literacy, Civics (see Greenville County School District), Psychology and African American Studies.
8. Expand the number of social studies credits to four (4) credits (lowering the electives to 5.5 and thus not increasing the 24 credits to graduate.) U.S. History and Constitution would be spread out over a two-year period, each with a social studies credit. The end of course exam would cover only the content in the second year of the course.
9. The recommendation (not requirement) is to sequence social studies courses as follows:

Grade 9	Human Geography and Current Events (1 credit)
Grade 10	Modern World History (1200 to present) (1 credit)
Grade 11	US History and Constitution (2 credits)
Grade 12	Government (0.5 credit) and Economics (0.5)

Note: To ensure the high school subgroup review was seen in its entirety, the document was shared with the SC Department of Education. Examples of the high school document can be viewed in appendix C.

C. Findings of the National Review Panel

1. The standards are coherent around United States history but are redundant and minimize a global perspective. In addition, there appears to be a lot of standards in middle school courses, especially grade seven.
2. The standards should emphasize higher order thinking skills that require greater cognitive complexity and effort. Most of the skills in the current standards fall at the lower levels of Bloom's revised taxonomy. Tasks that ask students to analyze continuity, change over time, compare, evaluate cause and effect, analyze perspectives, and interpret sources should be included. More emphasis needs to be placed on finding information, interpreting it, and using it to make decisions rather than mainly "memory work". Focus more on inquiry as a skill.

Look at New York state's standards documents. It focuses more on skill acquisition rather than knowledge. There should be an overarching framework that assists students in building inquiry skills.

3. The standards should show greater diversity with the inclusion of women, African Americans, Latin American, American Indians and Hispanics and to include the challenges and changes over time.
4. Real life economic skills need to be taught earlier than high school. Too many students graduate without being prepared for daily real-life economics.
5. Consider a survey course in United States History in grade seven and still maintain United States History and Constitution in grade eleven which would allow for more inquiry-based instruction in grade eleven. World History could be taught in grade six and ten.
6. Within the standards, incorporate differing perspectives from groups and individuals covering the same time and same issue.
7. In grade 6 early river civilizations, Egypt and pre-Roman Nubia (present day Sudan) should be included. In addition, classical civilizations should include Ancient Egypt and Alexandria.
8. In the early grades there appears to be more standards. There is a question about whether teachers can teach them in the allotted time.
9. There is a lack of civics readiness skills for students, and civics is not well-defined in the standards. The recommendation is to include a strand from kindergarten to grade 12. There is a lack of core content knowledge to develop a foundation of civics and cultural understanding.

10. Continue themes of history, geography, economics and government after grade two.
11. In government, discussions on United Nations and international courts should be prior to the comparison and contrast of constitutional right and human rights. In addition, students should understand United Nations documents before discussing international agreements.
12. In the United States History and Constitution course, it is suggested to add the Anti-Federalist Papers which argued against a stronger federal government. Also include revolutionary events in South Carolina.
13. In Modern World History, the inclusion of socialism and communism should be included in the discussion of Capitalism.
14. Include the role of South Carolina in World Wars and the effects in South Carolina.
15. The use of the term, enslaved Africans rather than slaves, is important as the former speaks to a human, legal condition set upon them.
16. In making predictions about a current event, there was a concern about what was an "appropriate news source". Should examples be provided and/or non-examples?
17. The listing of "specific content expected to be taught" is a weakness. The omission leaves schools responsible to determine the content which can lead to inconsistencies and knowledge gaps throughout the state.

Greater specificity should be provided in the standards and alignment guides to answer the question, "What can a teacher expect a student to know at a specific grade level?"

The standards should specify the content a student should encounter. For example, a standard might ask students to contextualize South Carolina's role in the development of a new nation but leave teachers to determine what content and materials is best to fulfill them.

One member stated, "South Carolina's standards are content-aware but not content specific."

18. The time spent on social studies in elementary grades has diminished. If it is not tested, it might not be taught.
19. In addition to the economic and political causes of the Civil War include the social causes. In addition, more emphasis needs to be placed on Jim Crow state and local laws.
20. In U.S. History and Constitution, more content should be provided on the transatlantic

slave trade and/or slavery.

21. Tap into resources in South Carolina such as the SC Archives and History, SC Historical Society and SC Library at USC.
22. In U.S. Government course, the role South Carolina played in the Constitutional Convention should be taught.
23. The terminology used in the standards such as enduring understanding and disciplinary thinking skills is too vague and not easily understood by teachers and parents. Clarify the definition of standard, which is content students should know and be able to do.
24. The expectations for students to “think like an historian” or “to interpret like an economist” are worthy goals but are not developmentally appropriate in most grades. Instead, the standards in the early grades should draw upon experts and artifacts such as maps, stories, and timelines. In the middle grades, students can use that knowledge to describe cause and effect, and continuity and changes, and finally in high school to reason like experts by analyzing evidence and evaluating interpretations.

IV: EOC RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations that are listed below are based on the detailed review of the South Carolina College and Career Ready Social Studies Standards and are supported by the detailed comments that appear in the state and national review panel findings included in this report, as well as the joint discussion with the national panel.

1. Consider framing United States History and Constitution and world history standards within a time period to assist teachers with a contextual lens upon which to develop lessons and teaching practices. AP World History, AP US Government and Politics, and AP United States History frameworks may be helpful.
2. Ensure students have the historical context and background knowledge in content prior to beginning instruction on a standard.
3. Consider support of the removal of the state budget proviso that suspends the testing of social studies in grades 3-8 to promote the teaching of social studies and civics education.
4. Develop a civics strand from kindergarten to grade 12. There is a lack of core content knowledge to develop a foundation of civics and cultural understanding.
5. Address the redundancy in the content across grade levels to reduce the number of standards.
6. Provide access to teachers to primary sources for all history classes. The learning

objective repository (LOR) would be a site for such documents.

7. Address the lack of sufficient diversity, especially regarding gender, persons with disabilities, and ethnicities within the standards.
8. Standards should focus on a global perspective. Students should have greater exposure to global events, past and present.
9. Prioritize what has been identified as essential for all students to know – those standards that are the most critical to teach, learn, and master within one year. This would be helpful to accommodate the learning needs of students with disabilities as an example.
10. Improve the rigor by benchmarking social studies standards with national and international standards. The rigor could be improved by benchmarking the standards against national standards using the report, *Benchmarking for Success: Ensuring U.S. Students Receiving a World-class Education* (Achieve, 2008) or International Benchmarking Blueprint (Education Commission of the States, 2009) for guidance.

Review the C3 Framework's inquiry on which to build a progression of skills for the new social studies standards. The standards should emphasize higher skills that require greater cognitive complexity and effort and include a rationale for both skill and content progressions across all grade levels.

11. The expectations for students to "think like an historian" or "to interpret like an economist" are worthy goals but are not developmentally appropriate in most grades. Instead, the standards should students in the early grades should learn the knowledge experts draw upon such as maps, stories, and timelines, then use that knowledge in the middle grades to describe cause and effect, and continuity and changes, and finally in high school to reason like experts by analyzing evidence and evaluating interpretations.
12. The standards should use common language to communicate to teachers and parents.
13. Greater specificity should be provided in the standards and alignment guides to answer the question, "What can a teacher expect a student to know at a specific grade level?"
14. A strong alignment document to assist teachers in the teaching of the social studies standards is needed and should be incorporated into the standards. Greater alignment between the two documents would prove to be beneficial to teachers. The suggestion is to look at Kentucky's social studies standards.

Appendices

Appendix A. Social Studies Standards Review Timeline

Timeline for Education Oversight Committee (EOC) Social Studies Review

April 5, 2025

Date	Action Item
February 28, 2025	National Reviewers Finalized
March 5	Letter announcing the process of social studies review to Governor, Ms Barton, President of Senate, Speaker, House Ed Chair, Senate Ed Chair, State Board and EOC Board
March 5	Letter requesting nominations for state social studies committee to House Ed, Senate Ed, State Board, EOC Board, Superintendents, Instructional Leaders, Quincy Moore, District Information Coordinators, School Improvement Councils
March 21	Nominations due to Hope
April 2	Social studies committee determined
April 16, 2025	State Review Committee Finalized
May 5, 2025	National Review Panel materials emailed
July 8, 2025	National Review Panel Conference Call
September 8, 2025	National Review Panel to submit Review Findings
September 22, 2025	Meeting of State Cyclical Review Committee
October 6, 2025	Meeting of State Cyclical Review Committee
October 20, 2025	Meeting (if needed) of State Cyclical Review Committee
November 17, 2025	Social Studies Standards Review Report Presented to EOC Academic and Standards Subcommittee
December 8, 2025	Social Studies Standards Review Report presented to EOC Final Report as approved by EOC forwarded to SCDE

Appendix B. Examples of Middle Schol Recommendations

Concerning the current 6th Grade Standards, we recommend the following:
Make the indicators more specific by incorporating the explanation that follows them.
For example:

CURRENT 6.1.CX Contextualize the origins and spread of major world religions and their enduring influence. This indicator was designed to promote inquiry into the development, basic tenets, and impact of Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Daoism, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism in relation to place and time.
SUGGESTED NEW INDICATOR 6.1.CX Contextualize the origins, development, basic tenets, and spread of Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Daoism, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism in relation to place and time.

We also recommend hyperlinking the standards and the Alignment Guide.
The use of maps should be hyperlinked and made available and emphasized in the Evidence sections of each standard.

Recommended Changes (in red):

<u>6.1.CO</u> Current	Compare the development of social systems among the early river valley civilizations.
<u>6.1.CO</u> Suggested	Compare the development of social systems among the early river valley civilizations of the Tigris-Euphrates, Nile/Kush, Indus, and Huang He Rivers.
<u>6.2.CE</u> Current	Explain the impact of global exchanges among world civilizations.
<u>6.2.CE</u> Suggested	Explain the impact of global exchanges (the Silk Road, Trans-Saharan Trade, and the Crusades) among world civilizations.

However, should it be decided to keep 7th as World Geography, we make the following suggestions:

<u>7.1.1.PR</u> Current	Identify select African physical systems and human characteristics of places. This indicator was designed to encourage inquiry into the primary physical and human characteristics of places within the African continent, such as landforms, water bodies, countries, and cities.
<u>7.1.1.PR</u> Suggested	Identify select African physical systems and human characteristics of places and this indicator was designed to encourage inquiry into the primary physical and human characteristics within the African continent such as landforms, bodies of water , countries, and cities.
<u>7.1.2.ER</u> Current	7.1.2.ER Identify climate and vegetation regions of Africa and the spatial distributions and patterns of natural resources, including the impact of their location on human activities.

	This indicator was designed to encourage inquiry into the distribution and pattern of physical systems within the African continent and how the locations and characteristics of these systems influence livelihood choices available to people.
<u>7.1.2.ER</u> Suggested	7.1.2.ER Identify climate and vegetation regions of Africa and the spatial distributions and patterns of natural resources, including the impact of their location on human activities., analyzing how their locations and characteristics influence human activities and livelihood choices across the continent. This indicator was designed to encourage inquiry into the distribution and pattern of physical systems within the African continent and how the locations and characteristics of these systems influence livelihood choices available to people.

Settlement and Development

Standard 1: Demonstrate an understanding of the development of South Carolina during the settlement and colonization of North America in the period of 1500– 1756.

Enduring Understanding: The Carolina colony was composed of indigenous, immigrant, and enslaved populations. Various factors across North America and the Carolina colony facilitated the eventual emergence of an American national identity.

8.1.CO Current	Compare the three British North American colonial regions economically, politically, socially, and in regard to labor development. This indicator was developed to encourage inquiry into how the three British colonial regions developed in terms of their culture, economies, geography, and labor. The indicator was also developed to encourage inquiry into the unique story of the development of South Carolina.
8.1.CO Suggested	Compare the three British North American colonial regions economically, politically, socially, and in regard to labor development, to include the unique story of the development of South Carolina.

Revolution and Identity

Standard 2: Demonstrate an understanding of how South Carolinians and Americans created a revolutionary form of government during the period of 1757– 1815.

Enduring Understanding: Political and economic developments underscored how the colonists in British North America had become uniquely American, prompting the development of a new nation. Drawing on their experience under British rule, the founding generation created a government with shared powers between the state and federal institutions.

<u>8.2.CO</u> Current	Compare the motives and demographics of loyalists and patriots within South Carolina and the colonies. This indicator was developed to encourage inquiry into the economic, political, and social motivations of the patriots and the loyalists in the era of the American Revolution.
<u>8.2.CO</u> Suggested	Compare the economic, political, and social motives and demographics of loyalists and patriots within South Carolina and the colonies in the era of the American Revolution.
8.2.CE Current	Explain the economic, political, and social factors surrounding the American Revolution. This indicator was developed to encourage inquiry into how the colonies began to unify to create a distinctive American identity over the course of events of the American Revolution.

<u>8.2.CE</u> Suggested	Explain how the economic, political, and social factors began to unify the colonies and create a distinctive American identity over the course of the American Revolution era.
----------------------------	---

Compromises and Conflict

Standard 3: Demonstrate an understanding of conflict and compromise in South Carolina, the Southern region, and the United States as a result of sectionalism between the period 1816–1865.

Enduring Understanding: As the nation expanded, regional differences were exacerbated creating sectionalism threatening South Carolina’s identity and American unity. South Carolina struggled to maintain its unique culture and economy throughout the Reconstruction Era.

<u>8.3.CO</u> Current	Compare the debates between South Carolina and the federal government regarding slavery, federalism, and the Constitution. This indicator was developed to encourage inquiry into the debates, heightened by Westward Expansion, over federal and state power concerning slavery, and the government’s role in protecting and securing natural rights.
<u>8.3.CO</u> Suggested	Compare the debates between South Carolina and the federal government regarding slavery, federalism, and the Constitution. Incorporate corrective edits on alignment guide (1816-1877)

At a Crossroads

Standard 4: Demonstrate an understanding of South Carolina’s role in and response to the dynamic economic, political, and social developments in the United States and around the world during the period 1862–1929.

Enduring Understanding: Beginning with Reconstruction, South Carolina searched for ways to revitalize its economy and determine the social and political status of its population. Later in the period, South Carolina both contributed to World War I and grappled with economic depression.

<u>8.4.CO</u> Current	Compare perspectives toward reform that emerged during the Progressive Era. This indicator was designed to encourage inquiry into how new state and federal Progressive legislation affected individuals and businesses in South Carolina and the U.S. The indicator was also designed to promote inquiry into the new perspectives that emerged regarding social and political change.
<u>8.4.CO</u> Suggested	Compare perspectives toward reform during the Progressive Era that led to changes in the areas of labor, African American rights, temperance, and women’s suffrage through state and federal legislation and constitutional amendments.

Progress

Standard 5: Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of world events on South Carolina and the United States from 1929 to present.

Enduring Understanding: As a result of new perspectives on national security following World War I, South Carolina continues to benefit from and contribute to national and global communities. Additionally, civic participation and social change altered South Carolina’s social standing and political alignment.

<u>8.5.CO</u>	Compare South Carolina and U.S. wartime contributions and demobilization after World War II.
---------------	--

Current	This indicator was designed to promote inquiry into military and economic policies during World War II, to include the significance of military bases in South Carolina. This indicator was also developed to foster inquiry into postwar economic developments and demographic changes, to include the immigration of Jewish refugees following the Holocaust.
8.5.CO Suggested	Compare South Carolina's economy from the Great Depression to its current economic diversification, including the New Deal, tourism, global trade and industry, and the maintenance of military bases.

Appendix C. High School Examples of Recommendations for Course Specifics

United States History and the Constitution

Comprehensive <i>What, if anything, is missing?</i>	Rigor <i>Are standards complex? Challenging? Progress to higher order thinking?</i>	Measurability <i>Can standards be translated into effective assessments?</i>	Manageability <i>Realistic to address scope of standards in a class? Why/why not?</i>	Organization <i>Are standards clear, concise, coherent, free of unnecessary jargon?</i>
• Pre-European and general treatment of Native peoples • The Washington Administration • Coverage of major wars is exceptionally light • Key SCOTUS cases and realigning elections (1800, 1828, 1860, 1896, 1932, 1980) • Really weak on post-WWII world • Women's history, African-American history, Asian-American history, Mexican-American history (groups are	• They don't progress to higher order thinking- "evaluate" or "synthesize" never really show up in here • The use of DOK in the existing standards is missing the mark and largely ignored • Students should be directed to build arguments as an extension and part of analyzing materials	• Not really. The way they are written is more appropriate for a written assessment (that is heavily reliant on reading comprehension skills) than the constructed/select ed response set-up of the EOC. • <i>Lack of open response items on the existing EOC limits capacity to assess the higher order thinking skills in standards</i> • Alignment guide is far more	• Realistic to address scope- but that's because the standards are too thin. They are missing SO many key details • Some teachers report that even with the thin standards, pacing is impossible (covering all of US History in effectively 17 weeks due to EOC timing) • Lack of chronological ordering in standards is challenging for teachers and students	• Chronology would make more sense than the effort to shove everything into the "deconstructed skills" lens • I hate the two tiered indicator system (student action followed by explanation of what "indicator was developed to do....") • Incoherence throughout- example 1.CE talks about American Revolution but stretches until 1791 • <i>Terminology/voc</i>

depicted as having history done “to them” rather than “by them”) • Middle colonies need to be included in the pre-1776 standards		manageable than the standards- and the division of the two documents causes confusion for teachers, public, etc. • <i>Standards need to reflect/include the detail provided in the Alignment document</i> • The way the standards are written makes it hard to measure if students are lacking content knowledge and historical skills- or both • The standards and the EOC are intertwined in terms of how the standards are experienced in the classroom	• Would be more manageable if a timeline of key events was provided with each period within the standards (could emphasize events that stretch across time periods, such as Western Expansion, Jim Crow, etc.) • Would be helpful for teachers to have clarity on connection of other content areas (Econ, Geography, US Government) • <i>Currently, there is inequity between how this course is handled for AP/Honors and non-AP standards.</i> Districts are often providing additional	<i>ab needs to be common across ALL US History grade levels.</i> Terms that are currently handled differently include: Transatlantic Trade/Triangular Trade, Northern Colonies/ New England Colonies
---	--	--	---	---

			instructional time (year-long block) for AP, whereas non-AP is almost always a semester block. <u>BOTH levels of the course need/deserve the additional time.</u>	
--	--	--	--	--

1205 Pendleton Street
Room 502 Brown Building
Columbia, SC 29201
www.eoc.sc.gov



The South Carolina Education Oversight Committee (EOC) is an independent, nonpartisan group of 18 educators, business people, and elected officials appointed by the legislature and governor. The EOC enacts the South Carolina Education Accountability Act of 1998, which sets standards for improving the state's K-12 educational system. The EOC reviews the state's education improvement process, assesses how schools are doing, and evaluates the standards schools must meet to build the education system needed to compete in this century.