

**AGENDA**

**Academic Standards & Assessments Subcommittee Meeting**

Monday, September 16, 2024  
10:00 a.m.  
Room 433, Blatt Building

- I. Welcome ..... Dr. Patty Tate
- II. Approval of Minutes of May 20, 2024 ..... Dr. Patty Tate
- III. Action Item:  
Cut Score Concordance of College Readiness Exams.....  
Dr. Matthew Lavery
- IV. Information Items:  
Cyclical Review of the Accountability System Update ..... Dana Yow
- V. EOC Strategic Plan Update ..... Dr. Matthew Lavery & Dana Yow
- VI. Adjournment

April Allen  
CHAIR

Brian Newsome  
VICE CHAIR

Terry Alexander  
Melanie Barton  
Russell Baxley  
Neal Collins  
Bob Couch  
Bill Hager  
Barbara B. Hairfield  
Kevin L. Johnson  
Sidney Locke  
Dwight Loftis  
Jeri McCumbee  
Melissa Pender  
Patty J. Tate  
C. Ross Turner, III  
Ellen Weaver

Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee

Dr. Patty Tate, Chair	Sidney Locke
Rep. Terry Alexander	Sen. Dwight Loftis
Rep. Bill Hager	Melissa Pender
Barbara Hairfield	Sen. Ross Turner

## **SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

### **Academic Standards & Assessments Subcommittee**

Minutes of the Meeting

May 20, 2024

**Members Present (in-person or remote):** Dr. Patty Tate, Rep. Terry Alexander, Sen. Dwight Loftis, Sidney Locke, Rep. Bill Hager, Melissa Pender, Barbara Hairfield and Sen. Ross Turner

**EOC Staff Present:** Gabrielle Fulton, Tenell Felder, Dr. Jenny May, Dr. Matthew Lavery, Dr. Rainey Knight, Hope Johnson-Jones, and Dana Yow

ASA committee chair Dr. Patty Tate opened the meeting and asked for a motion to approve the ASA committee meeting minutes from March 18. After the minutes were approved, Dr. Tate called Dr. Sara Jane Arnett forward to present the Military Connected Students annual report.

Dr. Arnett stated that she would report on the academic performance of military connected students compared to non-military connected students, provide a purple star school overview, and then conclude with findings and recommendations.

She stated the Military Family Quality of Life Enhancement Act was established in 2014 to enhance quality of life issues for members of the armed forces, findings and recommendation for future policies, procedures and legislation to better support military connected students.

Dr. Arnett then clarified that by federal definition, military connected students are defined as students whose parent is active duty or serves full-time in the national guard or reserves.

She also clarified that Power School was the source of the report data, clarifying that students identified in Power School by codes 00, 01 or 02 are not considered Military Connected in the report.

In regard to local level reporting, Dr. Arnett stated that 25 South Carolina School Districts reported zero military connected students which raised the question of the accuracy of self-reported data.

Dr. Arnett stated the report included more information on racial makeup, enrollment percentage by grade and Advanced Placement Exam passage of military connected students.

Dr. Arnett then addressed how military connected students outperformed nonmilitary students on the kindergarten readiness assessment (KRA). This assessment measures readiness in social

foundations, language and literacy, math, and physical wellbeing. She referred to Table 9 in the report which showed that the Military Connected Student was more likely to score Meets or Exceeds in Mathematics, ELA and Science during the 2022-2023 school year.

Next, Dr. Arnett presented the report's findings for Military Connected Students performance for the End of Course Exam, High School Graduation Rates and Attendance rates. The report indicated that military connected students outperformed nonmilitary students and all three of those sections. She suggested that Military Connected Students might perform better due to increased responsibilities from being in a military family.

Next, Dr. Arnett discussed the Purple Star Schools Program, a statewide initiative that recognizes school districts and campuses that show a concerted commitment to military-connected families. She shared that to date, there are 13 designated Purple Star Schools and two public charter schools. In addition to this, there are two school districts actively working to receive designation.

Dr. Arnett then discussed findings and recommendations from the report. Significant findings included an increase in *Active-Duty Military Wounded within the last year*, and in *Active Duty Military Deceased within last year*. Because of this finding, she reached out to the Department of Defense suicide prevention for statistics to help account for the steep increase of deceased active military.

Dr. Arnett then stated that improvement in data quality and additional research were needed. In regard to data quality issues, Dr. Arnett stated this could cause issues in fully understanding the needs of military connected students.

She also noted the lack of uniform military student identifier collection protocol. She asserted that the lack of a universal definition of a military connected student is a nationwide issue that several organizations and the federal government are trying to address.

Dr. Arnett then stated that district level reporting of military connected children excludes National Guard and Reserves. She stated this was significant considering the report's information on academic performance does not include data from National Guard or Reserve children and urged state leadership to address that issue.

She then addressed the issue with a lack of reporting and consistency so the information, stating it needed to be fixed.

This concluded Dr. Arnett's presentation.

EOC Executive Director Dana Yow thanked Dr. Arnett, noting that she brought both professional and personal knowledge to this year's report. She agreed with Dr. Arnett's emphasis on the need for improved data quality and accuracy. Yow added the finding she found surprising was the data on military connected students who had lost a parent.

Dr. Arnett then commented that in her personal experience, she has noted a lack of resources for military families during some of her family's deployment, particularly for military children who had lost their parents due to suicide.

Questions were then accepted.

Senator Dwight Loftis asked how schools are asked for their information on their military connected students.

Yow replied that the information is usually collected as a part of student registration and is done through PowerSchool, adding that there is no uniform method for collection throughout the districts. The field that parents select to indicate if their child is a military student is not mandatory, therefore a parent could just skip the question.

Senator Loftis suggested that the schools require the military field be filled out and then asked if the fields were clear.

Dr. Arnett replied that the fields were not clear and did not allow for nuances in identification or for multiple relevant fields to be selected.

Barbara Hairfield then commented that she recalled the high priority her district placed on collecting military impact aid forms because schools received money for every student with a military affiliation.

Next, Representative Terry Alexander asked what services public schools provide to military children.

Dr. Arnett referred to Purple Star Schools that provide programs, peer-to-peer mentor groups and had a point of contact for new military connected students when they begin at a new school. She also stated that schools should have a dedicated web page with a point of contact for military connected children's parents to access. She suggested schools provide professional development to staff and administration to help meet the specific challenges and emotional needs of military connected kids.

Yow then mentioned that a majority of military students are transient and might be in two or more schools in one school year which further supports the need for military connected students to have special resources.

She also stated the report suggested that some of that federal impact aid dollars could be leveraged for school districts that are supplying resources for military-connected students.

Dr. Arnett then spoke about how she utilized such resources when her family moved from Michigan to South Carolina. In addition, she spoke of how she is involved with a school district that set aside a portion of their military impact aid to employ a military student liaison.

Rep. Alexander then asked how much Federal Impact Aid comes into South Carolina.

Dr. Arnett replied she did not have the information at the moment but could look it up.

Melissa Pender shared that Beaufort County was a Purple Star School district and that Coosa Elementary School, which she is principal of, has a full-time military liaison. Pender stated that their military liaison supports military students through running lunch groups and meeting with newly deployed students and helping to prep students for deployment. Pender said the liaison also supported students academically and emotionally.

Yow commented that she wanted to address another recommendation in the report to include military connected as a filter on the education data dashboard to showcase the importance of reporting accurate data. She noted this might encourage school districts that reported zero military connected students to collect the information.

Representative Bill Hager asked if schools received aid for students whose parents served in the National Guard.

Jason Fowler from the South Carolina Department of Veteran Affairs clarified that National Guard is included if the parent is serving full time. He also stated he would work on getting the Federal Impact Aid for the committee member who requested it.

Senator Loftis asked about the status of how students are classified.

Yow clarified they were classified through Power School.

Senator Loftis then commented his agreeance that military children generally did better academically than non-military children due to having to have more responsibility.

Dr. Arnett replied that that has seemed to be true citing personal experience with her own children. She also stated that she was impressed with what Pender shared about her school's military support for military connected children.

Rep. Alexander then asked Dr. Arnett what her ideal program for military connected children would look like.

Dr. Arnett replied that she would like a general awareness of the different challenges military children face daily. She also stated she would change the classification indicators so that military students whose parents were deceased would still receive needed services.

This concluded the question-and-answer period.

Dr. Tate asked for a motion to approve the recommendations in the report. The committee moved to approve the report recommendations.

Next, Dr. Tate called EOC Deputy Director Dr. Matthew Lavery to present an information item on the cut score concordance of college readiness exams.

Dr. Lavery reviewed that a concordance study establishes a relationship between two tests that measure similar, but not identical, constructs. He then explained how college ready benchmarks are established for the ACT and the SAT.

He presented to the committee the following three staff recommendations that were up for discussion:

- Use ACT college ready benchmarks to set  $ACT \geq 21$  as College-Ready, and concordance study to match with  $SAT \geq 1080$
- Keep current College-Ready criterion of  $ACT \geq 20$ , and concordance study to match with  $SAT \geq 1040$ .
- Use SAT college ready benchmarks to set  $SAT \geq 1010$  as College-Ready, and concordance study to match with  $ACT \geq 21$

He then reviewed the discussion questions committee members asked which were as followed:

- How many students (and by extension, their schools) would be affected by the proposed change?
- What do district personnel say about this proposed change?
- How well do the ACT and SAT predict college success for SC graduates?

To the first question, Dr. Lavery responded that the proposed change would reduce college ready students by .3%

To the second question, Dr. Lavery responded that he sent a follow up survey to district Teaching and Accountability personnel to ask them to rank order the priorities that the EOC could consider for College Ready criteria. Of the items, the two that ranked the highest were as follows:

- College Ready criteria should indicate evidence that a student will be successful in college.
- College Ready criteria should reflect the admissions requirements of colleges in SC.

Dr. Lavery responded that as a whole, the priorities differed vastly.

For the third question on how well do the ACT and SAT predict college success for graduates, Dr. Lavery responded that 78.7% of ACT takers go to college and 83.8% of SAT takers go to college while 65% of them persist.

Following the conclusion of his presentation, Dr. Lavery accepted questions from committee members.

Next, EOC communications manager Tenell Felder was asked to provide an update on the EOC retreat. Members were asked to ensure that they reserved their hotel room. Committee member Russell Baxley was thanked for his assistance in helping with establishing a meeting place.

Following this, the meeting was adjourned.

## EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

**DATE:** September 16, 2024

**SUBCOMMITTEE:**

**Academic Standards & Assessments Subcommittee**

**ACTION ITEM:**

**Cut Score Concordance of College Readiness Exams**

**PURPOSE/AUTHORITY**

§ 59-18-900(A) The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish the format of a comprehensive, web-based, annual report card to report on the performance for the State and for individual primary, elementary, middle, high schools, career centers, and school districts of the State. The comprehensive report card must be in a reader-friendly format, using graphics whenever possible, published on the state, district, and school websites, and, upon request, printed by the school districts. The school's rating must be emphasized and an explanation of its meaning and significance for the school also must be reported. The annual report card must serve at least six purposes:

- (1) inform parents and the public about the school's performance including, but not limited to, that on the home page of the report there must be each school's overall performance rating in a font size larger than twenty-six and the total number of points the school achieved on a zero to one hundred scale;
- (2) assist in addressing the strengths and weaknesses within a particular school;
- (3) recognize schools with high performance;
- (4) evaluate and focus resources on schools with low performance;
- (5) meet federal report card requirements; and
- (6) document the preparedness of high school graduates for college and career.

**CRITICAL FACTS**

According to concordance tables, the current college ready scores for the ACT and SAT used to determine college readiness in use in the accountability for the ACT and SAT are ***not*** equivalent to one another.

- The current college ready benchmarks for the ACT produce a composite score of **21**
- Current CCR criterion for ACT is set to 20 in Accountability Manual
- The current college ready benchmarks for the SAT produce a combined score of **1010**
- Current criterion for SAT is set to 1020 in Accountability Manual

Based on member discussion of options, the staff recommendation is to keep the current College-Ready criterion of **ACT  $\geq$  20**, and concordance study to match with **SAT  $\geq$  1040**

**TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS**

The EOC has considered this as an information item for discussion during three ASA subcommittee meetings:

- November 13, 2023
- January 22, 2024
- May 20, 2024



**ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC**

**Cost: no impact**

**ACTION REQUEST**

**For approval**

**For information**

**ACTION TAKEN**

**Approved**  
 **Not Approved**

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

**EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

Date: September 16, 2024

**INFORMATION ITEM:**

**Cyclical Review of the Accountability System**

**PURPOSE/AUTHORITY**

**§ 59-18-910. Cyclical review of accountability system; stakeholders; development of necessary skills and characteristics.**

Beginning in 2020, the Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education and a broad-based group of stakeholders, selected by the Education Oversight Committee, shall conduct a comprehensive cyclical review of the accountability system at least every five years and shall provide the General Assembly with a report on the findings and recommended actions to improve the accountability system and to accelerate improvements in student and school performance. The stakeholders must include the State Superintendent of Education and the Governor, or the Governor's designee. The other stakeholders include, but are not limited to, parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators. The cyclical review must include recommendations of a process for determining if students are graduating with the world-class skills and life and career characteristics of the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate to be successful in postsecondary education and in careers. The accountability system needs to reflect evidence that students have developed these skills and characteristics.

**TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS**

The upcoming year marks the second time the accountability system will be reviewed, per state law.

**ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC**

No economic impact currently.

**ACTION REQUEST**

For approval

For information

**ACTION TAKEN**

Approved  
 Not Approved

Amended  
 Action deferred (explain)

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
§ 59-6-100	Within the Education Oversight Committee, an Accountability Division must be established to report on the monitoring, development, and implementation of the performance-based accountability system and reviewing and evaluating all aspects of the Education Accountability Act and the Education Improvement Act.	<p>HISTORY: 1998, Act No. 400</p> <p>Established the EOC as the reviewer of the state accountability system and Education Improvement Act (EIA), which was implemented in 1984.</p> <p>When the Education Accountability Act (EAA) of 1998 was enacted, there was not a separate federal accountability system. SC was a forerunner in establishing a formal reporting system for evaluating the performance of public schools and school districts.</p> <p>With passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, SC public schools were accountable to two systems – the state accountability system AND a federal accountability system that was based on Adequate Yearly Progress and following the allowance of Education and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waivers from certain requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 which were granted to many states.</p>	<p>While South Carolina has witnessed improvements in student performance since passage of the Education Accountability Act in 1998, the rate of improvement has not accelerated to meet the ever-expanding needs of our state. Too many South Carolina students are ill-served by the current public education system.</p> <p>Will recent changes made to the growth system in the accountability system for elementary and middle schools and greater access to data tools allow schools to focus efforts and interventions for students in a more focused way?</p>
§ 59-6-110. Duties of Accountability Division	The division must examine the public education system to ensure that the system and its components and the EIA programs are functioning for the enhancement of student learning. <u>The division will recommend the repeal or modification of statutes, policies, and rules that deter school improvement.</u> The division must provide annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the Education Oversight Committee no later than February first. <u>The division is to conduct in-depth studies on implementation, efficiency, and the effectiveness of academic improvement efforts and:</u> <u>(1) monitor and evaluate the implementation of the state standards and assessment;</u>	<p>HISTORY: 1998, Act No. 400</p> <p>Established the EOC’s authority as it relates to examining EIA programs and other programs that impact school improvement.</p> <p>Established the EOC as authority for state accountability system, “a performance based accountability system for public education which focuses on improving teaching and</p>	<p>Current limitations in data collection prohibit in-depth studies that target the effectiveness of efforts – i.e. are programs/policies impacting student performance?</p> <p>Will current efforts of the Coordinating Council for Workforce Development (CCWD) and others allow for a cohesive, usable PK-workforce longitudinal data system and strategy in order to evaluate impact and return on investment (ROI) of state dollars?</p>

**SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System**

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p><u>(2) oversee the development, establishment, implementation, and maintenance of the accountability system;</u>  <u>(3) monitor and evaluate the functioning of the public education system and its components, programs, policies, and practices and report annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the commission no later than February first of each year; and</u>  <u>(4) perform other studies and reviews as required by law.</u></p> <p><u>The responsibilities of the division do not include fiscal audit functions or funding recommendations except as they relate to accountability. It is not a function of this division to draft legislation and neither the director nor any other employee of the division shall urge or oppose any legislation. In the performance of its duties and responsibilities, the division and staff members are subject to the statutory provisions and penalties regarding confidentiality of records as they apply to students, schools, school districts, the Department of Education, and the Board of Education.</u></p>	<p>learning so that students are equipped with a strong academic foundation.”</p>	
<p>§59-18-120 (7), Definitions</p>	<p>"Performance rating" means the classification a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state's standards-based assessment, student growth or student progress from one school year to the next, graduation rates, and other indicators as determined by federal guidelines and the Education Oversight Committee, as applicable. To increase transparency and accountability, the overall points achieved by a school to determine its 'performance rating' must be based on a numerical scale from zero to one hundred, with one hundred being the maximum total achievable points for a school.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400,</p> <p>Revisions made in June 2017 merged the state and federal accountability systems into one system.</p> <p>Established a rating system for schools based on a 100-point scale.</p>	<p>Does the current rating system communicate properly and transparently to students, families, and the general public?</p> <p>In two statewide public opinion research studies conducted by the EOC, the expectation is that 80 to 90 percent of students should be on grade level in a school rated <i>Excellent</i>; that is not true in the current system.</p>
<p>§ 59-18-310(B)(1)</p>	<p>(B)(1) The statewide assessment program must include the subjects of English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in grades three through eight, as delineated in Section 59-18-320, and end-of-course tests for courses selected by the State Board of Education and approved by the Education Oversight Committee for federal accountability, which award units of credit in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. A student's score on an end-of-year assessment may not be the sole criterion for placing the student on academic probation, retaining the student in his current grade, or</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400,</p> <p>Revisions made in June 2017 eliminated the need for students to take an exit exam to receive a high school diploma.</p>	<p>Did the removal of the requirement for a high school exit exam help students, schools, or the system?</p> <p>While we don't have impact data, students are graduating from SC high schools while not passing end-of-course exams in core content areas.</p> <p>The EOC is studying the prevalence of credit recovery in SC schools, which allows students to recover the credits and not pass the end-of-course exam. Does this practice help students, schools, or the system?</p>

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>requiring the student to attend summer school. Beginning with the graduating class of 2010, students are required to pass a high school credit course in science and a course in United States history in which end-of-course examinations are administered to receive the state high school diploma. Beginning with the graduating class of 2015, students are no longer required to meet the exit examination requirements set forth in this section and State Regulation to earn a South Carolina high school diploma.</p>		
<p>§ 59-18-325(8)(A)</p>	<p>Beginning in eleventh grade for the first time in School Year 2017-2018 and subsequent years, all students must be offered a college entrance assessment that is from a provider secured by the department. In addition, all students entering the eleventh grade for the first time in School Year 2017-2018 and subsequent years must be administered a career readiness assessment. The results of the assessments must be provided to each student, their respective schools, and to the State to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) assist students, parents, teachers, and guidance counselors in developing individual graduation plans and in selecting courses aligned with each student's future ambitions;</li> <li>(2) promote South Carolina's Work Ready Communities initiative; and</li> <li>(3) meet federal and state accountability requirements.</li> </ol>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400,</p> <p>Revisions made in June 2017 required that students be offered a college entrance exam and they must take a career readiness exam.</p>	<p>Some states are beginning to phase in a requirement for students to have a measure of college-or-career readiness before they can receive a high school diploma. Should SC consider a similar requirement?</p> <p>Are the current career readiness exam offerings providing students with something of value when they leave high school?</p> <p>Are the results of the assessments being used in accordance with the law, in developing and selecting courses best suited to students?</p> <p>Some states are also using a college readiness assessment to measure ELA and math performance at the high school level.</p>
<p>§ 59-18-320. Review of field test; general administration of test; accommodations for students with disabilities; adoption of new standards.</p>	<p>(A) After the first statewide field test of the assessment program in each of the four academic areas, and after the field tests of the end of course assessments of high school credit courses, the Education Oversight Committee, established in Section 59-6-10, will review the state assessment program and the course assessments for alignment with the state standards, level of difficulty and validity, and for the ability to differentiate levels of achievement, and will make recommendations for needed changes, if any. The review will be provided to the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, the Governor, the Senate Education Committee, and the House Education and Public Works Committee as soon as feasible after the field tests. The Department of Education will then report to the Education Oversight Committee no later than one month after receiving the reports on the changes made to the assessments to comply with the recommendations.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400</p> <p>Revisions made in 2017 removed obsolete language</p> <p>Outlines the process by which the EOC reviews and is part of the process of adoption of new standards and reviews and adopts assessments</p> <p>Social studies summative testing currently suspended by Proviso 1.72 in the 2024-25 Appropriation Act in all grade levels except high school.</p>	<p>The EOC will need to do a review of upcoming assessments to meet the requirements of statute. The current schedule requires the EOC to review upcoming tests on this schedule:</p> <p>Fall/Winter 2024: Review Biology I (including Alt assessment)            Fall 2025: SC READY Science; SC READY ELA; English 2 (all Alt assessments included)            Fall 2026: SC READY Math, Algebra I (includes Alt)</p>

**SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System**

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>(B) After review and approval by the Education Oversight Committee, and pursuant to Section 59-18-325, the standards-based assessment of mathematics, English/language arts, social studies, and science will be administered for accountability purposes to all public school students in grades three through eight, to include those students as required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act and by Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To reduce the number of days of testing, to the extent possible, field test items must be embedded with the annual assessments. To ensure that school districts maintain the high standard of accountability established in the Education Accountability Act, performance level results reported on school and district report cards must meet consistently high levels in all four core content areas. For students with documented disabilities, the assessments developed by the Department of Education shall include the appropriate modifications and accommodations with necessary supplemental devices as outlined in a student's Individualized Education Program and as stated in the Administrative Guidelines and Procedures for Testing Students with Documented Disabilities.</p> <p>(C) After review and approval by the Education Oversight Committee, the end of course assessments of high school credit courses will be administered to all public school students as they complete each course.</p> <p>(D) Any new standards and assessments required to be developed and adopted by the State Board of Education, through the Department of Education for use as an accountability measure, must be developed and adopted upon the advice and consent of the Education Oversight Committee.</p>		

**SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System**

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
§ 59-18-325(6)	<p>Within thirty days after providing student performance data to the school districts as required by law, the department must provide to the Education Oversight Committee student performance results on assessments authorized in this subsection and end-of-course assessments in a format agreed upon by the department and the Oversight Committee. The results of these assessments must be included in state ratings for each school beginning in the 2017-2018 School Year. <u>The Oversight Committee also must develop and recommend a single accountability system that meets federal and state accountability requirements by the Fall of 2017.</u> While developing the single accountability system that will be implemented in the 2017-2018 School Year, the Education Oversight Committee shall determine the format of a transitional report card released to the public in the Fall of 2016 and 2017 that will also identify underperforming schools and districts. These transitional reports will, at a minimum, include the following: (A) school, district, and statewide student assessment results in reading and mathematics in grades three through eight; (B) high school and district graduation rates; and (C) measures of student college and career readiness at the school, district, and statewide level. These transitional reports will inform schools and districts, the public, and the Department of Education of school and district general academic performance and assist in identifying potentially underperforming schools and districts and in targeting technical assistance support and interventions in the interim before ratings are issued.</p> <p>(7) When standards are subsequently revised, the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Education Oversight Committee shall approve assessments pursuant to Section 59-18-320.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 2014 Act No. 155</p> <p>Revisions made in 2017 outlined the formation of a <u>single accountability system</u>.</p> <p>During the development of a single system, State law suspended ratings of schools and districts from school year 2014-15 until school year 2017-18.</p> <p>Outlines the requirement for EOC to approve assessments when standards are revised.</p>	
§ 59-18-350. Cyclical review of state standards and assessments; analysis of assessment results.	<p>(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</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400</p> <p>Revisions in 2014 provided for 7-year review of academic content standards and removed SC as part of Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium</p>	EOC to begin review of Social Studies standards in 2025.

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>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.</p>		
<p>§ 59-18-355. Content standards revisions; required approval.</p>	<p>(A)(1) A revision to a state content standard recommended pursuant to Section 59-18-350(A), as well as a new standard or a change in a current standard that the State Board of Education otherwise considers for approval as an accountability measure, may not be adopted and implemented without the:</p> <p>(a) advice and consent of the Education Oversight Committee; and</p> <p>(b) approval by a Joint Resolution of the General Assembly.</p> <p>(2) General Assembly approval required by item (1)(b) does not apply to a revision recommended pursuant to Section 59-18-350(A), other approval of a new standard, and other changes to an old standard if the revision, new standard, or changed standard is developed by the State Department of Education.</p> <p>(B) A revision to an assessment recommended pursuant to Section 59-18-350(A), as well as a new assessment or a change in a current assessment that the State Board of Education otherwise considers for approval as an accountability measure, may not be adopted and implemented without the advice and consent of the Education Oversight Committee.</p> <p>(C) Upon initiating a change to an existing standard, including a cyclical review, the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education shall provide notice of their plans and intent to the General Assembly and the Governor.</p> <p>(D) Nothing in this section may be interpreted to prevent the Department of Education, Board of Education, and Education Oversight</p>	<p>HISTORY: 2014 Act No. 200 (H.3893), § 2, eff June 19, 2014.</p> <p>Codifies process for adoption and implementation of standards and EOC's involvement.</p>	



SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	Committee from considering best practices in education standards and assessments while developing its own standards and assessments.		
<p>§ 59-18-900(A) Annual report cards; performance ratings; criteria; annual school progress narrative; trustee training; data regulations; military-connected student performance reports.</p>	<p>The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish the format of a comprehensive, web-based, annual report card to report on the performance for the State and for individual primary, elementary, middle, high schools, career centers, and school districts of the State. The comprehensive report card must be in a reader-friendly format, using graphics whenever possible, published on the state, district, and school websites, and, upon request, printed by the school districts. The school's rating must be emphasized and an explanation of its meaning and significance for the school also must be reported. The annual report card must serve at least six purposes:</p> <p>(1) inform parents and the public about the school's performance including, but not limited to, that on the home page of the report there must be each school's overall performance rating in a font size larger than twenty-six and the total number of points the school achieved on a zero to one hundred scale;</p> <p>(2) assist in addressing the strengths and weaknesses within a particular school;</p> <p>(3) recognize schools with high performance;</p> <p>(4) evaluate and focus resources on schools with low performance;</p> <p>(5) meet federal report card requirements; and</p> <p>(6) document the preparedness of high school graduates for college and career.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400,</p> <p>Revisions in 2017 outlines the need to document college and career readiness on the report card</p> <p>Outlines the purposes of the web-based school report cards</p> <p>Primary, career and district report cards removed in 2017.</p>	<p>College and career readiness measures for high school accountability are widely regarded as generous. And, in many instances, we do not have documented data that show that these measures do in fact lead to readiness in college or careers.</p> <p>How can high school accountability be strengthened to allow students to achieve more successful outcomes upon leaving high school?</p> <p>Schools with lower performance often receive more assistance. How can schools with higher performance be recognized and rewarded?</p>
<p>§ 59-18-900</p>	<p>(B)(1) The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education and a broad-based group of stakeholders, including, but not limited to, parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators, shall determine the criteria for and establish performance ratings of excellent, good, average, below average, and</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400,</p> <p>Revisions in 2017 tied ratings to the Profile of the SC Graduate</p>	<p>Do current school ratings provide a transparent picture of school performance?</p> <p>Do the indicators used in the current accountability system provide meaningful measures for students, schools, and the system as a whole?</p>

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>unsatisfactory for schools to increase transparency and accountability as provided below:</p> <p>(a) Excellent—School performance substantially exceeds the criteria to ensure all students meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate;</p> <p>(b) Good—School performance exceeds the criteria to ensure all students meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate;</p> <p>(c) Average—School performance meets the criteria to ensure all students meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate;</p> <p>(d) Below Average—School performance is in jeopardy of not meeting the criteria to ensure all students meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate; and</p> <p>(e) Unsatisfactory—School performance fails to meet the criteria to ensure all students meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate.</p> <p>(2) The same categories of performance ratings also must be assigned to individual indicators used to measure a school's performance including, but not limited to, academic achievement, student growth or progress, graduation rate, English language proficiency, and college and career readiness.</p> <p>(3) Only the scores of students enrolled continuously in the school from the time of the forty-five-day enrollment count to the first day of testing must be included in calculating the rating. Graduation rates must be used as an additional accountability measure for high schools and school districts.</p> <p>(4) The Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, shall establish student performance indicators which will be those considered to be useful for inclusion as a component of a school's overall performance and appropriate for the grade levels within the school.</p>		<p>What is the status of SCDE's measuring of skills/life and career characteristics in Profile?</p>

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>(C) In setting the criteria for the academic performance ratings and the performance indicators, the Education Oversight Committee shall report the performance by subgroups of students in the school and schools similar in student characteristics. Criteria must use established guidelines for statistical analysis and build on current data-reporting practices.</p> <p>(D) The comprehensive report card must include a comprehensive set of performance indicators with information on comparisons, trends, needs, and performance over time which is helpful to parents and the public in evaluating the school. In addition, the comprehensive report card must include indicators that meet federal law requirements. Special efforts are to be made to ensure that the information contained in the report card is provided in an easily understood manner and a reader-friendly format. This information should also provide a context for the performance of the school. Where appropriate, the data should yield disaggregated results to schools and districts in planning for improvement. The report card should include information in such areas as programs and curriculum, school leadership, community and parent support, faculty qualifications, evaluations of the school by parents, teachers, and students. In addition, the report card must contain other criteria including, but not limited to, information on promotion and retention ratios, disciplinary climate, dropout ratios, dropout reduction data, dropout retention data, access to technology, student and teacher ratios, and attendance data.</p> <p>(E) After reviewing the school's performance on statewide assessments and results of other report card criteria, the principal, in conjunction with the School Improvement Council established in Section 59-20-60, must write an annual narrative of a school's progress in order to further inform parents and the community about the school and its efforts to ensure that all students graduate with the knowledge, skills, and opportunity to be college ready, career ready, and life ready for success in the global, digital, and knowledge-based world of the twenty-first century as provided in Section 59-1-50. The narrative must be reviewed by the district superintendent or appropriate body for a local charter</p>		

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
	<p>school. The narrative must cite factors or activities supporting progress and barriers which inhibit progress. The school's report card must be furnished to parents and the public no later than November fifteenth for the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 School Years. To further increase transparency and accountability, for the 2018-2019 School Year, the school's report card must be furnished to parents and the public no later than October first. For the 2019-2020 School Year, and every subsequent year, the school's report card must be furnished to parents and the public no later than September first.</p> <p>(F) The percentage of new trustees who have completed the orientation requirement provided in Section 59-19-45 must be reflected on the school district website.</p> <p>(G) The State Board of Education shall promulgate regulations outlining the procedures for data collection, data accuracy, data reporting, and consequences for failure to provide data required in this section.</p>		
<p>§ 59-18-910. Cyclical review of accountability system; stakeholders; development of necessary skills and characteristics.</p>	<p>Beginning in 2020, the Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education and a broad-based group of stakeholders, selected by the Education Oversight Committee, shall conduct a comprehensive cyclical review of the accountability system at least every five years and shall provide the General Assembly with a report on the findings and recommended actions to improve the accountability system and to accelerate improvements in student and school performance. The stakeholders must include the State Superintendent of Education and the Governor, or the Governor's designee. The other stakeholders include, but are not limited to, parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators. The cyclical review must include recommendations of a process for determining if students are graduating with the world-class skills and life and career characteristics of the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate to be successful in postsecondary education and in careers. The accountability system needs to reflect evidence that students have developed these skills and characteristics.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400, Revisions made in 2017</p>	<p>The first cyclical review of the system occurred in 2020; to comply with State law, the 2<sup>nd</sup> review will commence in 2025.</p> <p>The requirement to consider the Profile of the Graduate in the cyclical review proved a challenge in 2020; will the competency-based work that the SCDE has done help? What is the status?</p>

**SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System**

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
§ 59-18-920. Report card requirements for charter, alternative, and career and technology schools.	A charter school established pursuant to Chapter 40, Title 59 shall report the data requested by the Department of Education necessary to generate a report card and a rating. The performance of students attending charter schools sponsored by the South Carolina Public Charter School District must be included in the overall performance ratings of each school in the South Carolina Public Charter School District. The performance of students attending a charter school authorized by a local school district must be reflected on a separate line on the school district's report card. An alternative school is included in the requirements of this chapter; however, the purpose of an alternative school must be taken into consideration in determining its performance rating. The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education and the School to Work Advisory Council, shall develop a report card for career and technology schools.	<p>HISTORY: 1998 Act No. 400</p> <p>Latest revisions made in 2017</p> <p>During the development of a single system, State law suspended ratings for schools and districts from school year 2014-15 until school year 2017-18.</p> <p>Beginning with the report cards for SY 2017-18, there was no requirement for districts or primary schools to receive ratings.</p> <p>Efforts have been made to develop primary report cards and cards for career and technology schools, to comply with this law, but each have not been successful.</p>	<p>We have an opportunity to develop career center report cards that are both creative and meaningful to stakeholders. How can we be successful? How can these complement work of the CCWD?</p> <p>Do ratings for districts need to be considered again?</p>
§ 59-18-1960. School growth measurement system.	In measuring annual school growth, with approval of the State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee, the State shall use a value-added system that calculates student progress or growth. A local school district may, in its discretion, use the value-added system to evaluate classroom teachers using student progress or growth. The estimates of specific teacher effects on the educational progress of students will not be a public record and will be made available only to the specific teacher, principal, and superintendent. Furthermore, the estimates of specific teacher effects also may be made to any teacher preparation programs approved by the State Board of Education. The estimates made available to the teacher preparation programs shall not be a public record and shall be used only in evaluation of the respective teacher preparation programs. Furthermore, educator effectiveness data must be exempt from public disclosure pursuant to Section 30-4-30, and may not be subject to the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act. An institution or postsecondary system receiving the estimates shall develop a policy to protect the confidentiality of the data.	HISTORY: 2017 Act No. 94 (H.3969), § 3, eff June 10, 2017.	Will recent changes made to the growth system in the accountability system for elementary and middle schools and greater access to data tools allow schools to focus efforts and interventions for students in a more focused way?
§ 59-29-240. Civics test	(A) For purposes of this section, "civics test" means the one hundred questions that, as of January 1, 2015, and updated accordingly, officers	HISTORY: 2015 Act No. 52 (S.437), § 2, eff June 3, 2015.	Self-reported by schools

SC State Code Citations and Current Budget Provisos that impact the State Accountability System

Code/Proviso	Relevant Text	History and Explanation	Research Questions/Considerations
<p>required; report.</p>	<p>of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services use in order that the applicants can demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals of United States history and the principles and form of United States government, as required by 8 U.S.C. 1423.</p> <p>(B) As part of the high school curriculum regarding the United States government required credit, students are required to take the civics test, as defined in subsection (A), provided there is no cost to a school or school district for obtaining and giving the test, but are not required to obtain a minimum score. However, a student who receives a passing grade, as determined by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, or better, may be recognized by the school district. This requirement applies to each student enrolled in a public or charter school in this State. This requirement does not apply to a student who is exempted in accordance with the student's individualized education program plan.</p> <p>(C) Each public school, including charter schools, must report the percentage of students at or above the designated passing score on the test to the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee which must then include such on the school report card.</p> <p>(D) No school or school district of this State may impose or collect any fees or charges in connection with this section.</p> <p>(E) This section must be applied to any student entering ninth grade beginning in the 2016-2017 school year.</p>		<p>Is this the most effective measure of civic readiness and is it valuable to students, schools, and the system?</p>
<p>§ 59-16-70. Review of student records by Education Oversight Committee.</p>	<p>At the end of each semester, the State Department of Education shall provide student records, including course grades and performance on state assessments, to the Education Oversight Committee. The Education Oversight Committee shall monitor the impact of credits earned in the virtual school, on the school and district ratings, with particular attention to performance on end-of-course examinations and graduation rates.</p>	<p>HISTORY: 2007 Act No. 26, § 1, eff May 15, 2007.</p>	