

K-12 Technology Initiative Report



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**



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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff expresses its appreciation to the following individuals who provided data and support for this report:

Don Cantrell, Valarie Byrd, and Claudette Flynn of the South Carolina Department of Education

Keith Osman and Adam Epting of the South Carolina Department of Administration

BACKGROUND

Governor Nikki R. Haley’s K-12 Education Reform Initiative of 2014 recommended state investment in educational technology and connectivity. “Modernizing technology in our schools and improving bandwidth will give students greater access to educational content and also critical computer skills their future employers will demand.”¹ The Governor specifically recommended \$29.3 million for “improving bandwidth to school facilities, bolstering wireless connectivity within school walls, and launching or enhancing 1-to-1 technology initiatives.”²

In Fiscal Year 2014-15 the General Assembly funded with lottery fund revenues the K-12 Technology Initiative. The Initiative has three objectives: to improve external connections to schools; to improve internal connections within schools; and to develop or expand one-to-one computing. The following table documents the annual appropriations to the K-12 Technology Initiative since its inception.

Table 1
K-12 Technology Initiative

Fiscal Year	Total Appropriation
2014-15	\$29,288,976
2015-16	\$29,288,976
2016-17	\$29,288,976
TOTAL:	\$87,866,928

Provisos in the annual general appropriations act established the funding formula and reporting requirements for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The portion of Proviso 3.6 of the 2015-16 General Appropriation Act that addressed the K-12 Technology Initiative is below.

Funds appropriated to the Department of Education for the K-12 Technology Initiative shall be distributed to the public school districts of the state, the special schools of the state and the South Carolina Public Charter School District, per pupil, based on the previous year’s one hundred thirty-five day average daily membership, according to the below calculations: (1) For a school district with a poverty index of less than 75: \$35 per ADM; (2) For a school district with a poverty index of at least 75 but no more than 85: \$50 per ADM; or (3) For a school district with a poverty index of greater than 85 or a special school with no defined poverty index: \$70 per ADM.

The Department of Education may adjust the per-ADM rates for each of the three classes defined above in order to conform to actual levels of student attendance and available appropriations, provided that the per-ADM rate for each class is adjusted by the same percentage.

¹ Governor Nikki R. Haley, “K-12 Education Reform Initiative.” 2014.
<<http://governor.sc.gov/News/Documents/Gov.%20Nikki%20Haley%20-%20K-12%20Education%20Reform%20Initiative%202014.pdf>>.

² Ibid.

Funds distributed to a school district through the K-12 Technology Initiative may only be used for the following purposes: (1) To improve external connections to schools, with a goal of reaching at least 100 kilobits per second, per student in each school by 2017; (2) To improve internal connections within schools, with a goal of reaching at least 1 megabit per second, per student in each school by 2017; or (3) To develop or expand one-to-one computing initiatives.

A school district that has achieved each of the above goals may submit a plan to the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee for permission to expend its allocation on other technology-related uses; such permission shall not be unreasonably withheld and the K-12 Technology Committee must permit districts to appeal any process should a district not receive approval and must provide technical assistance to districts in developing plans should the district request such.

Funds appropriated for the K-12 Technology Initiative may not be used to supplant existing school district expenditures on technology. By June 30, 2016, each school district that receives funding through the K-12 Technology Initiative during Fiscal Year 2015-16 must provide the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee with an itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds, using a form developed by the Education Oversight Committee. In this report, a school district must provide information on its efforts to obtain reimbursements through the "E-Rate" Schools and Libraries Program administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company. Within its available resources, the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee shall support school districts' efforts to obtain these reimbursements.

Per Proviso 3.6. the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) was charged with developing a form by which districts would report to the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee on how many funds were expended and for what purposes. Working with the South Carolina Department of Education, the EOC provided questions that were included in the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period to address the following issues related to the K-12 Technology Initiative:

- How were K-12 Technology Initiative Funds expended in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16?
- Are school districts and schools meeting the three objectives of the K-12 Technology Initiative: (1) to improve external connections to schools, with a goal of reaching at least 100 kilobits per second, per student in each school by 2017; (2) to improve internal connections within schools, with a goal of reaching at least 1 megabit per second, per student in each school by 2017; or (3) to develop or expand one-to-one computing initiatives?

Copies of the surveys, the District and School Technology Surveys, are in Appendix A.

The following is a summary of the school district and school responses to questions on the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period that pertain directly to the K-12 Technology Initiative.

DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY SURVEY RESPONSES

All 82 school districts, including the South Carolina Public Charter School District, responded to the survey. The following questions pertain to “bring your own devices” and online education opportunities in districts.

Question: Is your district moving toward student-owned learning devices as a replacement to district-owned devices?

Five school districts responded “yes” to this question. However, in reviewing the comments submitted, it was determined that the districts likely did not understand that the question pertained only to “bring your own devices” (BYOD) as opposed to district-assigned devices. There were three districts, however, who indicated that they had a BYOD policy or were considering the option in the future.

Question: Are courses offered in either a blended learning format (at least 50% of instruction online) or a completely online (100% of instruction online) format in your district? Do not include courses offered through VirtualSC.

No 51
Yes 31

The thirty-one districts that responded in the affirmative were:

Aiken	Horry
Allendale	Lancaster
Anderson 2	Laurens 55
Anderson 5	Laurens 56
Bamberg 1	Lexington 1
Berkeley	McCormick
Calhoun	Marlboro
Charleston	Oconee
Chester	Richland 2
Clarendon 1	Spartanburg 2
Darlington	Spartanburg 3
Dillon 4	Spartanburg 7
Edgefield	Sumter
Greenwood 51	Union
Greenwood 52	SC Public Charter School District
Hampton 2	

Finance Questions

The South Carolina Technology Counts Survey included questions related to the expenditure of K-12 Technology Initiative funds in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16. The following responses are all self-reported by each district.

In Fiscal Year 2014-15, the traditional school districts and the SC Public Charter School District were allocated \$29,038,395 for the K-12 Technology Initiative as documented in Appendix B. However, school districts reported spending \$34.8 million and carrying forward another \$8.9 million into Fiscal Year 2015-16. The EOC staff presumes that districts reported all funds, including state or other local funds, that were expended for technology rather than reporting only the K-12 Technology Initiative funds.

Table 2 documents that districts reported spending 67 percent for the purchase or replacement of devices. Another 16 percent was expended for internal connections within schools. Districts reported spending less than 3 percent to improve security.

Table 2
Fiscal Year 2014-15 K-12 Technology Initiative Funds

Expended For:	\$	%
Expand Broadband	\$1,142,242	3.3%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$5,487,276	15.8%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$2,741,237	7.9%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	\$20,570,317	59.2%
Improve Security	\$911,131	2.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$578,204	1.7%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$187,047	0.5%
Other	<u>\$3,144,033</u>	9.0%
TOTAL:	\$34,761,386	
Carried Forward to FY2015-16	\$8,924,293	

Question: For what purpose are the funds that were carried forward being expended in the current fiscal year, 2015-16?

Twenty-six (26) districts indicated that they used all or a portion of their carry forward funds to improve internal connections in schools. The fewest number of districts indicated that they would use a portion of their carry forward funds to improve security or expand broadband.

Table 3
2014-15 K-12 Technology Funds Carried Forward to 2015-16 For:

Purpose	# Districts
Expand Broadband	7
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	26
Replace Devices	19
Purchase or Lease New Devices	9
Improve Security	5
Professional Development for Classroom Teachers	7
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	8
Other	0

Note: A district could have indicated that they would expend carry forward funds for multiple purposes and these were counted.

In Fiscal Year 2015-16, school districts were allocated \$28,904,424 for the K-12 Technology Initiative as documented in Appendix B. Districts self-reported carrying forward an additional \$8.9 million from 2014-15 into 2015-16 (See Table 2) which totals \$37.8 million. However, in responding to the survey, districts reported spending \$37.4 million in 2015-16 and carrying forward \$5.2 million into Fiscal Year 2016-17, which sums to a total of \$42.6 million (Table 4). The self-reported data again likely includes local or other funds that were also expended for technology.

Of the \$37.4 million in total expenditures, districts reported spending two-thirds (63 percent) for the purchase or replacement of devices, a decline from 68 percent in the prior school year. Districts reported spending 20 percent for internal connections within schools, which is almost a four percent increase over the prior year. District reported spending less than 2 percent of funds to improve security, a slight decline from the prior school year.

**Table 4
Fiscal Year 2015-16 K-12 Technology Initiative Funds**

Expended For:	\$	%
Expand Broadband	\$992,838	2.7%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$7,305,817	19.5%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$3,674,583	9.8%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	\$19,777,432	52.8%
Improve Security	\$580,654	1.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$353,350	0.9%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$234,251	0.6%
Other	\$4,522,934	12.1%
TOTAL:	\$37,441,861	
Projected Funds Carried Forward to FY2015-16	\$5,198,138	

E-Rate Reimbursement

The EOC and the K-12 Technology Initiative Committee have been interested in knowing how many districts hire outside vendors or consultants to file E-Rate reimbursements and how much the districts pay for such service. The Educational Rate (E-Rate) Program was instituted under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to expand Internet and telecommunication connectivity for schools and libraries. Recent changes in the program have eliminated or reduced funding for services which have traditionally received full funding. Schools and libraries that are not monitoring this change will face significant funding loss and not be prepared. From district efficiency reviews conducted by Tidwell and Associates and released by the EOC in 2015, smaller districts struggle to keep up-to-date on technology.³

³ District Efficiency Reviews. <<http://www.eoc.sc.gov/reportsandpublications/Pages/SCDistrictEfficiencyReview.aspx>>.

Question: If your school district uses an outside vendor/consultant to assist in filing E-Rate reimbursements, identify the percentage of the total reimbursements that the vendor/consultant is paid to provide such services.

Thirty-seven (37) districts reported paying an outside vendor or consultant to file E-Rate reimbursements at a rate of 10 percent or less. If a district responded “not applicable,” it can be assumed that either district staff files for the E-Rate reimbursements or no E-Rate reimbursements were filed (Table 5).

**Table 5
Districts and E-Rate Reimbursements to Consultant Service Providers**

Percent of E-rate to Consultant	# Districts
0 to 5%	18
6 to 10%	19
11 to 15%	3
16 to 20%	3
21 to 25%	0
More than 25%	0
Not Applicable	37
Did Not Answer	2

SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY SURVEY RESPONSES

There were 1,248 schools in the 82 school districts that responded to the survey. The following questions highlight the technology capacity of individual schools, as reflected in the goals of the K-12 Technology Initiative.

Regarding internal connections, the answers to the following questions overwhelmingly show that schools have adequate internal connections per wireless or wired device at the school location.

Question: On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wireless student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?

Yes	1,072
No	138
Unknown	<u>38</u>
	1,248

Question: On averages, does each concurrent (actively in use) wired student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?

Yes	1,127
No	97
Unknown	<u>24</u>
	1,248

However, in looking at *internal connections* at the student level, the responses show that internal access can be improved for at least 40 percent of schools, based on the following question and responses.

Question: On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth between the local area network and central location, such as district office or other sites which host common accessed resources for this location?

Yes	691
No	527
Unknown	28
No Answer	<u>2</u>
	1,248

Question: What percentage of classrooms in this school has access to your school’s wireless network? A classroom is defined as “a room with a certified teacher who provides direct instruction to students.”

Table 6 documents the extensive internal access of classrooms to wireless access networks. Over 95 percent of all schools reported that between 91 and 100 percent of classrooms in their school had internal access to wireless networks.

**Table 6
Classroom Access to Wireless Network**

Percent of Classrooms	Number of Schools
0%	19
1 to 10%	14
11 to 20%	4
21 to 30%	2
31 to 40%	0
41 to 50%	2
51 to 60%	0
61% to 70%	5
71% to 80%	5
81 to 90%	4

91 to 100%	1,193
No Response	1
TOTAL	1,248

Question: What percentages of students in your school are served by 1:1 learning? For reporting purposes, a student is considered to be served with 1:1 learning when they have access to a personal device throughout the school day, whether that device is provided by the school district or the student.

Table 7 documents the wide range of responses to the question of 1:1 learning. Approximately 27 percent of schools have no students with 1:1 learning while 28 percent of schools have over 91 percent of students with 1:1 learning.

**Table 7
Percentage of Students with 1:1 Learning**

Percentage of Students	Number of Schools	Percent of All Schools
0%	335	26.8%
1 to 10%	95	7.6%
11 to 20%	63	5.0%
21 to 30%	72	5.8%
31 to 40%	31	2.5%
41 to 50%	93	7.5%
51 to 60%	66	5.3%
61 to 70%	25	2.0%
71 to 80%	88	7.1%
81 to 90%	22	1.8%
91 to 100%	353	28.3%
No Answer	<u>5</u>	0.4%
	1,248	

Of the 335 schools that reported having zero percent of students with 1:1 computing, 60 percent were either elementary or primary schools. These 335 schools were located in forty-eight districts. Table 8 documents the responses to this question by school district and by type of school and identifies schools that have grade spans that extend from elementary to middle and middle to high.

Table 8
Number of Schools in Each District
Reporting No 1: 1 Computing Capability in the School

District	Elementary-Middle-High	Elementary	Elementary-Middle	Middle	Middle-High	High	Primary	Total
Abbeville	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	7
Aiken	0	9	1	3	0	0	1	14
Allendale	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Anderson 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Anderson 2	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	6
Anderson 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Bamberg 1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Bamberg 2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Barnwell 19	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Barnwell 29	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Barnwell 45	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	4
Berkeley	0	8	0	2	1	6	4	21
Charleston	1	22	0	6	4	5	2	40
Chesterfield	0	7	0	3	1	3	2	16
Clarendon 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Clarendon 3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Colleton	0	5	0	1	0	0	2	8
Dillon 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dillon 4	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
Florence 1	0	11	0	2	0	1	2	16
Florence 3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Florence 4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Greenville	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	9
Greenwood 50	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greenwood 52	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Hampton 1	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	7
Horry	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Jasper	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Lancaster	0	8	0	2	0	3	0	13
Laurens 55	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	8
Laurens 56	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lexington 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lexington 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Lexington 5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Marion	0	1	0	2	0	1	3	7
Marlboro	0	1	4	1	0	1	1	8
McCormick	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Newberry	0	7	0	2	1	2	1	13
Oconee	0	6	0	2	0	3	0	11
Orangeburg 3	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	6

Pickens	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	9
Spartanburg 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Spartanburg 4	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Spartanburg 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Williamsburg	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
York 1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	7
York 3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
York 4	0	7	0	4	0	2	0	13
Total	2	165	12	50	9	47	37	322

Note: 13 schools did not have a known school type.

Question: Has the district/school adopted a goal of implementing/expanding 1:1 computing?

Yes	840
No	404
No Answer	<u>4</u>
	1,248

Two-thirds of schools reported having adopted a goal of implementing or expanding 1:1 computing. Of those schools responding that they have a goal to implement or expand 1:1 computing, schools were asked several questions about the grade levels for which 1:1 computing is targeted or has been implemented. The results are reflected in Table 9.

**Table 9
Number of Schools Responding
1:1 Computing by Grade Level**

Grade Level	Targeted	Not Targeted	Implemented	No Response
K	98	429	90	223
1	94	428	103	215
2	109	408	106	217
3	247	191	215	187
4	266	148	235	191
5	227	128	284	201
6	120	198	246	276
7	117	194	247	282
8	117	193	241	289
9	82	208	243	307
10	115	197	205	323
11	116	202	207	315
12	120	212	202	306

The responses document that schools that have implemented 1:1 computing have focused on grades 3 through 12. Schools that are targeting implementation of 1:1 computing are focusing on grades 3 through 5.

INTERNET BANDWIDTH

The EOC contacted the Division of Technology Operations at the South Carolina Department of Administration to determine the Internet bandwidth speeds for each school district between June of 2013 and June of 2016. June was selected as a point in time that coincides with the end of the school and fiscal years. The data provided are summarized in Table 10.

In June of 2013, there were 67 districts that had 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth. Six districts had 1000 MBs of Internet bandwidth. In June of 2016, there were 14 districts with 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth, and all districts had at least 100 MBs of Internet bandwidth. There were 32 districts with 1000 MBs or more of Internet bandwidth. The K-12 Technology Initiative Committee will now begin comparing Internet bandwidth to utilization to determine where to target resources to expand Internet bandwidth.

**Table 10
Internet Bandwidth by District, 2012-13 and 2015-16**

	2012-13	2015-16
Internet Bandwidth (MBs)	# Districts	# Districts
0	1	0
10	4	0
30 to 90	3	0
100 to 150	59	14
200 to 250	0	6
300 to 350	2	9
400 to 450	0	4
500 to 550	4	11
600 to 900	1	4
1,000	6	13
1,500	0	2
2,000	0	7
2,500	0	1
3,000	0	4
4,000	0	3
5,000	0	2
	80	80

Not included are the SC Public Charter School District and the Oconee County School District. Oconee County School District does not participate in the State K-12 Schools and Libraries Network; instead, connectivity is provided by the county to the district through a federal grant.

Source: Data provided to EOC by Division of Technology Operations at the South Carolina Department of Administration

FINDINGS

The data as reported by school districts and schools on the South Carolina Technology Counts Survey for the 2015-16 reporting period document the following as related to the objectives of the K-12 Technology Initiative:

K-12 Technology Initiative Funds Expenditures – For both Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16, school districts reported spending more K-12 Technology Initiative Funds than were appropriated for the initiative. The staff assumes that districts also spent local and other funds on technology and reported the expenditures in totem.

School districts reported spending the following percentage of their K-12 Technology Initiative Funds in Fiscal Years 2014-15 and 2015-16 for the following purposes. The percentage of funds expended for the replacement or purchase of devices was 67.1% in 2014-15 and 62.6% in 2015-16. The percentage of funds expended to improve internal connections increased from 15.8% in 2014-15 to 19.5% in 2015-16.

% of Total Expenditures for:

	FY2014-15	FY2015-16
Expand Broadband	3.3%	2.7%
Improve Internal Connections within Schools	15.8%	19.5%
Replace Devices (Computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	7.9%	9.8%
Purchase New Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students & teachers	59.2%	52.8%
Improve Security	2.6%	1.6%
Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	1.7%	0.9%
Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	0.5%	0.6%
Other	9.0%	12.1%

Internal Connections – Approximately 90 percent of schools reported having, on average, at least 1Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network for every wired or wireless student device. However, within the school walls, approximately 55 percent of schools have at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth within the school.

One-to-One Computing – Approximately 28 percent of schools reported having one-to-one computing available for 91 percent or more of their students. On the other end, approximately 27 percent of schools reported having no students with 1:1 learning. Two-thirds of schools reported having adopted a goal of implementing or expanding 1:1 computing. Schools that have implemented 1:1 computing have focused on grades 3 through 12. Schools that are targeting implementation of 1:1 computing are focusing on grades 3 through 5.

Internet Bandwidth - In June of 2013, there were 67 school districts that had 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth. Six districts had 1000 MBs of Internet bandwidth. In June of 2016, there were 14 districts with 150 MBs or less of Internet bandwidth, and all districts had at least 100 MBs of Internet bandwidth. There were 32 districts with 1000 MBs or more of Internet bandwidth.

District Technology Survey

1:1 Learning Questions

1) Is your district moving toward student-owned learning devices as a replacement to district-owned devices?

Yes

No

2) Please provide any comments.

Online Learning Questions

3) Are courses offered in either a blended learning format (at least 50% of instruction online) or a completely online (100% of instruction online) format in your district? Do not include courses offered through VirtualSC.

Yes

No

4) If yes, who manages the delivery system?

Finance Questions

In Fiscal Year 2014-2015 the General Assembly appropriated over \$29 million to school districts for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The law requires that districts must provide an "itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds." In collaboration with your district's finance/business officer, please provide an account of how the funds appropriated to your school district in Fiscal Year 2014-2015 were actually expended. (The TOTAL should equate to the amount allocated in Fiscal Year 2014-2015)

Category	Actual Expenditure
5) Expand Broadband	\$
6) Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$
7) Replace Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$
8) Purchase New (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students and teachers	\$
9) Improve Security	\$
10) Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$
11) Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$
12) Other	\$

13) Funds Carried Forward \$
Total Expenditures: \$

14) Were any funds carried forward?

- Yes
- No

15) For what purpose are the funds that were carried forward being expended in the current fiscal year, 2015-2016?

- Expand Broadband
- Improve Internal Connections within Schools
- Purchase or Lease Devices (computers, laptops, iPad, etc.)
- Improve Security
- Professional Development for Classroom Teachers
- Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff
- Other

16) If other, please explain.

In Fiscal Year 2015-2016 the General Assembly appropriated over \$29 million to school districts for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The law requires that districts must provide an "itemized report on the amounts and uses of these funds." In collaboration with your district's finance/business officer, please provide an account of how the funds appropriated to your school district in Fiscal Year 2015-2016 were actually expended. (The TOTAL should equate to the amount allocated in Fiscal Year 2015-2016)

Category	Actual Expenditure
17) Expand Broadband	\$
18) Improve Internal Connections within Schools	\$
19) Replace Devices (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.)	\$
20) Purchase New (computers, laptops, iPads, etc.) to expand one-to-one computing for students and teachers	\$
21) Improve Security	\$
22) Professional Development to Classroom Teachers	\$
23) Technical Assistance for District Technology Staff	\$
24) Other	\$
25) Projected Funds Carried Forward	\$
Total Expenditures:	\$

26) If your school district uses an outside vendor/consultant to assist in filing E-Rate reimbursements, identify the percentage of the total reimbursements that the vendor/consultant is paid to provide such services.

- 0 to 5%
- 6 to 10%
- 11 to 15%
- 16 to 20%

21 to 25%
More than 25%
Not Applicable

Infrastructure Questions

Network

- 27) What percentage of network equipment, in both schools and at the district level, is up-to-date with the latest firmware and security patches?
- 0 – 25% up to date
 - 26 – 50% up to date
 - 51 – 75% up to date
 - 76 – 100% up to date
- 28) Are you able to measure network uptime?
- Yes
 - No
- 29) Are staff personal/mobile devices allowed on wired networks?
- Yes
 - No
- 30) If yes, is access controlled/restricted?
- Yes
 - No
- 31) Are staff personal/mobile devices allowed on wireless networks?
- Yes
 - No
- 32) If yes, is access controlled/restricted?
- Yes
 - No
- 33) If mobile devices are supported, is mobile device management employed?
- Yes
 - No

Infrastructure

Please provide the number of devices used by administrative staff and other non-instructional staff.

- 34) Desktops (District provided)
- 35) Laptops (District provided)
- 36) Tablets (District provided)
- 37) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 38) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 39) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Computer Aging

Indicate the number of functional computing devices at the district level, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. Include all computers, at the district level and office sites. Computers include laptops, netbooks, tablets, and desktops. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 40) Total less than 1 year old?
- 41) Total between 2 and 3 years old?
- 42) Total between 4 and 5 years old?
- 43) Total 5 years and older?

Servers

44) What Operating Systems are in use at the district?

- Windows
- Linux
- Apple
- UNIX

45) How many servers or Virtual Machines (VM) are used for PowerSchool at the district and/or school levels?

46) What is the total number of servers in use?

PowerSchool

47) What version of PowerSchool is currently installed?

48) Have you set up the field level security in PowerSchool?

- Yes
- No

49) What operating system is running on the PowerSchool server?

50) What third-party vendors are connected to PowerSchool?

Indicate the number of functional server devices at the district and school level, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 51) Total number of servers less than 1 year old?
- 52) Total number of servers between 2 and 3 years old?
- 53) Total number of servers between 4 and 5 years old?
- 54) Total number of servers 5 years and older?

Security Questions

55) What information security training methods are available and in use by all staff?

DVD

Videos

Virtual Class

Traditional Classroom

ETV

Vendor purchased solution

Libraries

Web-based

Other

None

56) At what frequency are user passwords required to be changed on a regular basis?

0 - 30 days

31 - 60 days

61 - 90 days

Greater than 90 days

Never

57) At what frequency are screensaver timeouts enabled?

1 - 5 minutes

6 - 10 minutes

11 - 15 minutes

16 - greater minutes

Never

Data

58) Is all confidential or personally identifiable information (PII) encrypted on servers?

Yes

No

59) Does your district require data encryption on all district/school portable devices?

60) Does your district allow sensitive data to be downloaded to portable devices?

Yes

No

61) Does your district allow the use of external storage devices (i.e. USB/thumb drives, portable hard drives, etc.)?

Yes

No

62) Have you installed a SSL Certificate for the PowerSchool Server?

Yes

No

Compliance: Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)

63) Which of the following provides the internet filtering service?

District

ISP

64) Additionally, is filtering provided individually on each internet enabled district level computing device?

Yes

No

Internet Safety Policy

The district's Internet Safety Policy includes:

65) Online activities of minors while under school jurisdiction is monitored for appropriate use.

Yes

No

66) Safe and secure use by minors of direct electronic communications (email, chat rooms, etc.) while under school jurisdiction, is assured.

Yes

No

67) Unauthorized online access, including "hacking" and other unlawful activities, is prohibited and stated in policy. Yes

No

68) Unauthorized disclosure, use and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors is prohibited and stated in policy.

69) Minors are educated about appropriate online behavior, including interacting with other individuals on social networking websites and in chat rooms and cyber-bullying awareness and response.

Yes

No

70) At least one public hearing or meeting occurred to address the proposed Internet Safety Policy.

Yes

No

Physical Security

71) Is access to servers' physical environment secured?

Yes

No

72) Are all portable computing devices physically secured both while in use and in storage?

Yes

No

Access Control

73) Does the district have a documented Access Control Policy?

Yes

No

74) Has the district documented access control procedures and associated access controls (e.g. new hire, transfer & terminated user process, obtaining privileged access, remote user access, password procedures, third-party access, etc.)?

Yes

No

75) Has the district developed procedures to administer privileged user access based on a Role Based Access Control (RBAC) model?

Yes

No

76) Does the district use Active Directory individual accounts?

Yes

No

77) Does the district use Active Directory group accounts?

Yes

No

78) Does the district use Active Directory system or application accounts?

Yes

No

79) Are access requests for information systems a documented procedure within the district?

Yes

No

80) Is the activity of the guest/anonymous or temporary accounts monitored?

Yes

No

Vulnerability

- 81) Does the district control, monitor and report privileged accounts periodically?
Yes
No
- 82) Has the district developed a Vulnerability Assessment Policy?
Yes
No
- 83) Does the district scan for vulnerabilities within information systems and hosted applications at least monthly?
Yes
No
- 84) Has the district determined a risk ranking strategy for identified vulnerabilities?
Yes
No
- 85) Does the district conduct penetration testing exercises on an annual basis (internal resources or third-party teams are acceptable)?
Yes
No
- 86) Has the district developed an information security incident response policy?
Yes
No
- 87) Does the district have an information security incident response team?
Yes
No
- 88) Does the district have a process in place for personnel to report information security incidents?
Yes
No
- 89) Has the district determined to whom the information security incidents will be shared and reported (e.g. incident response team and/or district management)?
Yes
No
- 90) Is the South Carolina Department of Education notified of information security incidents involving student level data?
Yes
No
- 91) Does the district monitor information systems to detect attacks or potential attacks?
Yes
No

Business Continuity Plan / Disaster Recovery

- 92) Does your district have documented plans for the continuity of business operations and the recovery of information technology systems in the event of a disaster or significant disruption?
Yes
No – Proceed to question 108
- 93) Does the documented organizational plan establish and list critical business functions with specified recovery priorities?
Yes
No
- 94) Does the Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP) specify the level of service (which the owner has agreed to be acceptable) to be provided while in recovery mode?
Fully Addressed
Partially Addressed
Not Addressed Yet
- 95) Does the district have a dedicated team of professionals focused on the continuity and recovery of service capabilities?
Yes
No
- 96) If not, does the district use an external service provider to plan for continuity and recovery needs?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 97) Does the district provide the schools with detailed contact information in the event of a disruption in service capabilities, outages, and/or emergencies?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 98) Does the district have an alternate site location for data center recovery purposes?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 99) If so, what is the approximate distance between the production or primary site and the alternate or secondary site for data center recovery purposes?
< 10 miles
11 - 25 miles
26 - 100 miles
100 miles Not Applicable

- 100) Is the processing capacity of the back-up facility equal to that of the primary facility?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 101) If not, what is the processing capacity of the back-up facility in proportion to the processing capacity of the primary facility?
< 25%
26 - 75%
75%
Not Applicable
- 102) Is it feasible to process/run normal business operations from the back-up facility for an extended period (i.e. at least 6 weeks)?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 103) Has the alternate location been tested?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 104) Does the district conduct exercise(s) of the DRP at least annually?
Yes
No
Not Applicable
- 105) When was the Business Continuity Plan (BCP) last tested?
Within the last 3 - 6 months
Within the last 7 - 12 months
Not within the last 12 months
Never been tested
Not Applicable
- 106) Does the district include IT personnel, operational personnel, or both in internal exercises?
IT Personnel
Operating Personnel
Both
Not Applicable
- 107) Do the auditors, internal or external, passively review and/or actively observe the exercises? Passively review only
Actively observe only Both
None
Not Applicable

Backups

108) Indicate how often data are backed up (i.e. files, databases, curriculum, etc.) at your district?

- Never
- By transaction
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly

109) How often are backups stored offsite?

- Never
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- More than monthly

Professional Development

110) Does the technical support staff receive ongoing professional development in the technologies they support?

- Yes
- No

111) Does the district staff receive ongoing professional development in the technologies they use?

- Yes
- No

Technology Support

Please list the number of IT staff for the following:

- 112) Number of Staff (FTE) : IT supervisors / administrators
- 113) Number of Staff (FTE) : Help Desk/ Break-Fix Support technicians
- 114) Number of Staff (FTE) : Developers of administrative systems
- 115) Number of Staff (FTE) : Developers of instructional system
- 116) Number of Staff (FTE) : Information Technology security
- 117) Number of Staff (FTE) : Other staff in Information Technology not listed above, including web development, database administration, networking staff, infrastructure staff, technology trainers
- 118) Please provide additional comments if necessary.

Funding

E-rate

119) Does the district apply for E-rate discounts on its own and/or as part of a consortium application?

- Yes
- No

School Technology Survey

Technology Capacity Questions

If your network topology is such that multiple locations share a common wide area network link along the way, factor in the total number of concurrent users that share a link.

- 1) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wireless student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 2) If unknown, please explain.

- 3) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) wired student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth from the device to the core of the local area network?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 4) If unknown, please explain.

- 5) On average, does each concurrent (actively in use) student device at this school location have access to at least 1 Mbps of bandwidth between the local area network and central location, such as district office or other sites which host commonly accessed resources for this location?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unknown

- 6) If unknown, please explain.

- 7) What percentage of classrooms in this school have access to your school's wireless network? A classroom is defined as "a room with a certified teacher who provides direct instruction to students."

0%	81-90%
1-10%	
11-20%	
21-30%	
31-40%	
41-50%	
51-60%	
61-70%	
71-80%	

91-100%

1:1 Learning Questions

For reporting purposes, a student is considered to be served with 1:1 learning when they have access to a personal learning device throughout the school day, whether that device is provided by the school district or the student.

8) What percentages of students in your school are served by 1:1 learning?

- 0%
- 1-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-100%

9) Has the district/school adopted a goal of implementing/expanding 1:1 computing?

- Yes
- No – Skip to question 36

10) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade K?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

11) If grade K has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

12) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 1?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

13) If grade 1 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

14) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 2?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted
- Implemented

15) If grade 2 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

16) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 3?

- Targeted
- Not Targeted

Implemented

17) If grade 3 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

18) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 4?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

19) If grade 4 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

20) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 5?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

21) If grade 5 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

22) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 6?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

23) If grade 6 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

24) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 7?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

25) If grade 7 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

26) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 8?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

27) If grade 8 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

28) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 9?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

29) If grade 9 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

30) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 10?

Targeted

Not Targeted

Implemented

31) If grade 10 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

- 32) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 11?
Targeted
Not Targeted
Implemented
- 33) If grade 11 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?
- 34) Has 1:1 computing been targeted or implemented for grade 12?
Targeted
Not Targeted
Implemented
- 35) If grade 12 has been targeted, what is the target date of completion?

Online Learning Questions

- 36) What is the number of courses offered at this school where the primary mode of instruction is at least 50% online (blended learning)? Do not include courses offered by VirtualSC.
- 37) What is the number of courses offered at this school where 100% of instruction is provided online (online courses)? Do not include courses offered by VirtualSC.
- 38) If the number of online courses is 1 or more, what courses are offered?
- 39) How many students have completed 1 or more courses where at least 50% of instruction is provided online (blended learning) in the past year?
- 40) How many students have completed 1 or more courses where 100% of instruction is provided online (online courses)? Do not include courses completed through Virtual SC.

Infrastructure Questions

Infrastructure

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for student use.

- 41) Desktops (District provided)
- 42) Laptops (District provided)
- 43) Tablets (District provided)
- 44) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 45) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 46) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for teachers.

- 47) Desktops (District provided)
- 48) Laptops (District provided)
- 49) Tablets (District provided)
- 50) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 51) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 52) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices dedicated for instructional aides and other instructional employees.

- 53) Desktops (District provided)
- 54) Laptops (District provided)
- 55) Tablets (District provided)
- 56) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 57) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 58) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Please provide the number of devices used by administrative staff, counselors, and other non-instructional staff.

- 59) Desktops (District provided)
- 60) Laptops (District provided)
- 61) Tablets (District provided)
- 62) Tablets (User Owned BYOD)
- 63) Mobile Devices (District provided)
- 64) Mobile (User Owned BYOD)

Computer Aging

Indicate the number of functional computing devices in the school, by age (as of the end of the current school year). Do not include equipment retired and designated for salvage or stolen. Include all computers, including employee and student use; academic and non-academic; and in schools and office sites. Computers include laptops, netbooks, tablets, and desktops. If refurbished equipment was purchased, select the original date of the equipment (i.e., the original date is 2006 and the refurbished date is 2010).

- 65) Total less than 1 year old?
- 66) Total between 2 and 3 years old?
- 67) Total between 4 and 5 years old?
- 68) Total 5 years and older?

Classroom Technology

How many of the following does your school have available and in use?

- 69) Interactive White Boards (do not count devices used solely for administrative, non-classroom purposes).
- 70) Interactive Digital Monitors (do not count devices used solely for administrative, non-classroom purposes).
- 71) Projectors (do not count vintage, overhead projectors, or document camera projectors).

Appendix B
 Allocations of K-12 Technology Funds
 FY2014-15 and FY2015-16

District	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Abbeville	\$152,313.00	\$141,475.95
Aiken	\$832,418.00	\$789,167.80
Allendale	\$87,877.00	\$82,227.10
Anderson 1	\$318,531.00	\$308,010.28
Anderson 2	\$128,374.00	\$122,999.31
Anderson 3	\$125,438.00	\$118,929.20
Anderson 4	\$98,504.00	\$92,917.27
Anderson 5	\$428,364.00	\$408,150.46
Bamberg 1	\$68,366.00	\$62,429.54
Bamberg 2	\$53,708.00	\$44,766.35
Barnwell 19	\$53,899.00	\$45,673.27
Barnwell 29	\$63,913.00	\$59,474.80
Barnwell 45	\$117,788.00	\$107,165.36
Beaufort	\$687,288.00	\$676,595.43
Berkeley	\$1,047,430.00	\$1,038,614.54
Calhoun	\$113,011.00	\$112,031.64
Charleston	\$1,500,405.00	\$1,484,924.95
Cherokee	\$430,063.00	\$407,245.86
Chester	\$264,045.00	\$239,692.64
Chesterfield	\$362,788.00	\$335,507.60
Clarendon 1	\$53,823.00	\$50,429.45
Clarendon 2	\$204,548.00	\$186,993.48
Clarendon 3	\$41,391.00	\$39,694.96
Colleton	\$408,101.00	\$377,932.15
Darlington	\$511,182.00	\$475,330.75
Dillon 3	\$77,738.00	\$74,954.09
Dillon 4	\$286,411.00	\$273,532.90
Dorchester 2	\$811,081.00	\$811,342.98
Dorchester 4	\$147,438.00	\$139,759.74
Edgefield	\$117,184.00	\$156,559.57
Fairfield	\$193,020.00	\$174,954.18
Florence 1	\$540,203.00	\$519,949.58
Florence 2	\$58,881.00	\$55,112.87

	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
District	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Florence 3	\$249,951.00	\$238,253.78
Florence 4	\$51,682.00	\$46,912.92
Florence 5	\$70,431.00	\$63,910.35
Georgetown	\$468,255.00	\$439,373.97
Greenville	\$2,512,393.00	\$2,432,442.33
Greenwood 50	\$302,330.00	\$412,301.61
Greenwood 51	\$47,686.00	\$43,349.99
Greenwood 52	\$57,352.00	\$54,050.83
Hampton 1	\$166,907.00	\$154,607.76
Hampton 2	\$63,531.00	\$52,626.29
Horry	\$1,347,574.00	\$1,925,767.31
Jasper	\$190,687.00	\$176,185.89
Kershaw	\$356,706.00	\$342,059.00
Lancaster	\$405,335.00	\$400,021.29
Laurens 55	\$277,718.00	\$273,402.68
Laurens 56	\$145,564.00	\$140,342.42
Lee	\$149,311.00	\$135,330.33
Lexington 1	\$802,740.00	\$792,228.61
Lexington 2	\$426,121.00	\$408,171.49
Lexington 3	\$93,984.00	\$89,937.07
Lexington 4	\$219,735.00	\$204,921.45
Lexington 5	\$568,313.00	\$544,450.22
McCormick	\$54,367.00	\$51,464.70
Marion	\$344,952.00	\$315,876.17
Marlboro	\$288,263.00	\$265,873.39
Newberry	\$285,859.00	\$278,211.31
Oconee	\$365,479.00	\$333,994.00
Orangeburg 3	\$198,705.00	\$184,964.66
Orangeburg 4	\$185,724.00	\$245,818.03
Orangeburg 5	\$448,930.00	\$428,325.88
Pickens	\$563,731.00	\$531,864.52
Richland 1	\$1,142,470.00	\$1,100,601.34
Richland 2	\$905,322.00	\$877,472.80
Saluda	\$105,492.00	\$100,046.21
Spartanburg 1	\$169,255.00	\$161,501.26
Spartanburg 2	\$340,558.00	\$322,316.54

	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION
	2014-15	2015-16
	(Revenue Code 3630)	(Revenue Code 3630)
District	(Subfund 963)	(Subfund 963)
Spartanburg 3	\$98,852.00	\$134,231.58
Spartanburg 4	\$93,039.00	\$86,747.13
Spartanburg 5	\$263,818.00	\$258,644.18
Spartanburg 6	\$371,061.00	\$356,179.71
Spartanburg 7	\$341,090.00	\$320,389.97
Sumter	\$813,726.00	\$770,834.14
Union	\$206,475.00	\$188,613.02
Williamsburg	\$309,386.00	\$280,310.63
York 1	\$171,703.00	\$164,478.67
York 2	\$227,055.00	\$224,435.04
York 3	\$594,301.00	\$568,746.79
York 4	\$386,491.00	\$402,838.62
SC Public Charter	\$402,461.00	\$564,449.68
Subtotal:	\$29,038,395.00	\$28,904,423.61
Special School and Districts		
<u>District: 5204 - State Supported</u>	\$0	\$4,137.35
John de la Howe	\$1,750.00	\$3,770.55
Wil Lou Gray	\$28,070.00	\$22,623.30
Deaf & Blind	\$18,873.00	\$16,003.67
DJJ	\$46,803.00	\$47,428.89
Palmetto Unified	\$51,139.00	\$35,289.70
TOTAL:	\$29,185,030.00	\$29,033,677.07

Source: "Monthly Payments to Districts." Office of Finance. SC Department of Education. <http://ed.sc.gov/finance/financial-services/payment-information/monthly-payments-to-districts/>

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director 803.734.6148.