STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MOLLY M. SPEARMAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

August 29, 2019

Chairman Wm. Weston J. Newton
Legislative Oversight Committee
Blatt Building, Room 228
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Re: Legislative Oversight Committee – Response to Follow-up Questions

Dear Chairman Newton:

Thank you for your letter dated August 20, 2019. The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) is committed to helping gather public input on the functions of the agency, our state's K–12 public education system, and the legislative oversight process. We will use our various established channels of communication with stakeholders and the general public to solicit feedback.

Additionally, your letter contained follow-up questions gathered from the Legislative Oversight Committee Public Input Meeting held on August 13, 2019. Below you will find responses to each of these questions.

Follow-up Questions

1. What is the state salary schedule for bus drivers?

The SCDE presents this pay scale as a guide to help districts in determining local school bus driver wages for the 2019–20 school year. As of July 1, 2010, one year of experience is equal to performing the duties of an SCDE-certified school bus driver for at least 152 days in a single school year, including summer school.

Years of Experience	2019–20 DRIVER PAY SCALE	Years of Experience	2019–20 DRIVER PAY SCALE
0	$7.85	12	$9.50
1	$7.87	13	$9.68
2	$7.89	14	$9.86
3	$7.92	15	$10.06
4	$8.09	16	$10.27
5	$8.23	17	$10.47
6	$8.40	18	$10.68
7	$8.58	19	$10.90
8	$8.77	20	$11.11
9	$8.95	21	$11.33
10	$9.13	22+	$11.55
11	$9.31		

2. How are teachers evaluated in the virtual education program?

Teachers are evaluated in multiple ways. First, as with all state employees, they are reviewed annually using the Employee Performance Management System (EPMS) in December of each year. Second, we evaluate teachers based on the SC Teaching Standards 4.0 Rubric. Although the teaching standards rubric is geared toward brick and mortar teachers, we did some work to better align that rubric to a virtual environment and then shared our work with the Office of Educator Effectiveness and Leadership Development to ensure such alignment existed. Attached is a copy of the modified rubric that we use to evaluate our teachers (VirtualSC Online Teaching Standards). From there, we aligned the teacher's major job functions to the VirtualSC Online Teaching Standards document so that when the teachers are evaluated using the EPMS system, we are making sure they are also being evaluated using the attached teaching standards. Thus, everything we do to evaluate a teacher is managed through the VirtualSC Online Teaching Standards document.

Additionally, we have a team that monitors each teacher's classroom to provide feedback and direct support. This team includes two Instructional Coaches, who monitor classes for trends and issues. The issues are reported to the Instructional Team Leader and then direct professional development and support is given to any teachers that are categorized in the 'Needs Improvement' rating. In addition, each content area has a Lead Teacher who also monitors the teachers based on the attached rubric. This team then shares their findings to ensure appropriate support is provided. Furthermore, a final class observation is conducted by our Instruction Team Leader a couple of times per year. All of this data, information, and required instructional improvements are then incorporated into the teacher's EPMS in December, which coincides with a one-on-one meeting between the teacher and the Instruction Team Leader.

While the state does not require temporary employees to be formally evaluated using the EPMS system, our practice is to have all temporary adjunct teachers go through the same review process aligned to the attached standards. While no formal EPMS is completed for those employees, their performance expectations and monitoring remain the same as full time teachers.

3. What are the minimum, maximum, median, and mean size of classes in the virtual education program?

The SCDE has developed a tiered system for determining the maximum number of students per class. The tiers are based several factors such as the number of graded assignments to be completed, amount of feedback required by the teacher, amount of student writing and revision required for the class, etc. The tiers were developed in conjunction with a team of our Lead Teachers several years ago based on their experiences with teaching the courses. We limit all teachers to four classes each semester based on best practices and the amount of feedback and communication required to be a successful online teacher according to our teaching standards rubric. On average most teachers have about 136 students per semester (across four classes). We monitor this number very closely to ensure that we are serving the maximum number of students that we can effectively and efficiently, while maintaining a high level of standards for our teaching staff. I have attached a copy of our tier guidelines to show the maximum number of students per class and the types of classes that would fall into that particular tier. The majority of our classes run between a maximum of 35–45 students, as you will see with a few courses having a few less or more.

There is no established minimum course size. However, for the most part, with the exception of a couple of courses (Latin being the main one and some of the more advanced AP courses), all of our courses fill to the maximum level as outlined in the tier. At this point, we rarely have a course that does not completely fill up.

4. What improvements have been made in special education services in the three school districts the agency directly manages?

General Information as Background

Background Context

Local Education Agency Data Determinations: The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B regulations at 34 CFR §§300.600(c) and 300.603 require state educational agencies (SEAs) to make "determinations" annually about the performance of each local education agency (LEA) (i.e., school districts, state operated programs, and charter authorizers). In making its LEA determinations based on the most recent data, the SCDE considered information collected for IDEA-required state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) reporting, during onsite program and fiscal monitoring visits, record reviews, and database reviews; through fiscal audits and dispute resolution processes; and/or from other

information available to the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE). The SCDE also considered the timely correction of noncompliance in making LEA determinations.

The SCDE assigns LEAs one of the following determination levels:
- Meets Requirements ,
- Needs Assistance,
- Needs Intervention, or
- Needs Substantial Intervention.

The SCDE's determinations system incorporates results-driven accountability (RDA). The system utilizes a point system with twelve factors, five compliance factors and seven performance factors, with zero to three points assigned for each factor depending on individual LEA performance. The compliance factors include timely and accurate data submissions; fiscal/grantee risk; IDEA timelines (initial evaluation and Part C to B transition); post-secondary planning and services (Indicator 13) compliance; and timely resolution of findings of noncompliance. The performance factors include graduation rates; English language arts (ELA) statewide assessment performance (grades 3–8); math statewide assessment performance (grades 3–8); school-age Least Restrictive Environment (LRE); preschool LRE; suspension of students with disabilities risk ratio; and career preparation state assessment performance.

Determination levels for LEAs are based on the total points (36 points maximum) that are calculated by adding the points from the twelve factors. These determination levels are then used to determine the type, nature, and intensity of technical assistance that the SCDE provides to each LEA:

Total Points	Determination Level	Type of Assistance
28–36	Meets Requirements	Self-Directed (SCDE makes available general information and universal technical assistance and support and the LEA selects appropriate assistance and support based on identified areas of need)
19–27	Needs Assistance	Collaborative (SCDE works collaboratively with the LEA to develop an improvement plan that matches technical assistance and support from the SCDE and other sources to identified areas of need for the LEA)
10–18	Needs Intervention	Focused (SCDE develops a targeted improvement plan of that includes professional

		learning opportunities, technical assistance, and other support that targets each identified area of need for the LEA and then, the SCDE works collaboratively with the LEA to ensure implementation of the plan)
0–9	Needs Substantial Intervention	Systemic (SCDE develops a comprehensive systemic improvement plan that includes professional learning opportunities, technical assistance, and other support to improve the LEA's system for delivering special education services and student outcomes, and then, the SCDE monitors and verifies the LEA's implementation of the plan)

If an LEA scores a zero on any factor, compliance or performance, targeted assistance is provided to the LEA in the relevant compliance or performance area. The following is a description of the point breakdown/scoring system used for the twelve factors:

Compliance Factor 1: Timely and Accurate Data Submission	
Score	Compliance Level
3	All data submissions are submitted on time (within the prescribed data collection windows) and no more than one data submission contained LEA (not system) errors
2	The LEA submitted late data submissions no more than two times during the reporting year and no more than two data submissions contained LEA errors
1	The LEA submitted late data no more than four times during the reporting year and no more than four data submissions contained LEA errors
0	The LEA submitted data late five or more times during the reporting year and five or more data submissions contained LEA errors

Compliance Factor 2: Fiscal/Grantee Risk	
Score	Compliance Level
3	Low risk based on fiscal monitoring risk factors
2	Moderate risk based on fiscal monitoring risk factors
1	High risk based on fiscal monitoring risk factors
0	High risk with systemic findings from a Tier III fiscal monitoring review

Compliance Factor 3: Post-Secondary Planning and Services (Indicator 13)	
Score	Compliance Level
3	100% compliant based on initial Indicator 13 submission
2	All Indicator 13 corrections made and verified within review timeframe
1	All Indicator 13 corrections made and verified within a year of findings
0	Indicator 13 corrections are pending for over a year

Compliance Factor 4: Timely Correction on Noncompliance	
Score	Compliance Level
3	No findings (finance, program, data, or compliance complaint) pending for over a year
2	One area that was not corrected within a year
1	Two areas that were not corrected within a year or one area not corrected within two years
0	Three areas that were not corrected within a year or two or more areas that were not corrected within two years

Compliance Factor 5: IDEA Timelines (Indicators 11 and 12)	
Score	Compliance Level
3	100% compliance for both Indicator 11 and Indicator 12
2	95% or above combined compliance rate for Indicators 11 and 12
1	85% or above combined compliance rate for Indicators 11 and 12
0	Below 85% combined compliance rate for Indicators 11 and 12

Performance Factors:
1. Graduation Rate (Indicator 1)
2. ELA Assessment Performance (Indicator 3C)
3. Math Assessment Performance (Indicator 3C)
4. School Age LRE (Indicator 5A)
5. Early Childhood Placement Settings (Indicator 6A)
6. SWD Suspension Rate
7. Career Preparation Assessment Performance (WorkKeys/WIN assessment)

Performance Factors	
Score	Performance Level
3	Meeting or exceeding State target for current year
2	At or above State performance level from prior year
1	At or above State performance level from prior year
0	Below prior year's State performance level and LEA's performance has not improved

Performance Factor Calculations:
1. Graduation Rate (Indicator 1) - State and LEA performance based on graduation percentage.
2. ELA Assessment Performance (Indicator 3C) - Number of students with IEPs grades 3–8 who scored meets or exceeds on SC READY ELA and alternate ELA assessments divided by the total number of students with IEPs grades 3–8 who took SC READY ELA and alternate ELA assessments.
3. Math Assessment Performance (Indicator 3C) - Number of students with IEPs grades 3–8 who scored meets or exceeds on SC READY Math and alternate math assessments divided by the total number of students with IEPs grades 3–8 who took SC READY Math and alternate math assessments.
4. School Age LRE (Indicator 5A) - Number of school age students with IEPs in LRE 80 percent or above divided by the total number of school-age students with IEPs.
5. Preschool Placement Settings (Indicator 6A) - Number of preschool students in regular early childhood programs and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood programs divided by the total number of preschool students with IEPs.
6. SWD Suspension Rate -Number of students with IEPs suspended out of school (OSS) during the school year divided by total number of students with IEPs.
7. Career Preparation Assessment Performance - Number of students with IEPs who received a National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) (bronze level or above on ACT WorkKeys/WIN assessment) divided by total number of students with IEPs who took ACT WorkKeys/WIN.

Fiscal Oversight
The Fiscal and Grants Management (FGM) Team in the Office of Special Education Services (OSES) utilizes a three-tier model to ensure that LEAs, charter schools, and SOPs are appropriately allocating and expending the funds and resources they receive under the grant provisions of the IDEA.

> **Tier I**: Annually, each Special Education Services department at LEAs and SOPs is required to submit a self-assessment questionnaire that includes general questions about pertinent policies and procedures that should be in place. Also, each LEA and SOP are required to submit a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) compliance worksheet for the prior year to ensure that the LEA/SOP has met the MOE compliance standard. The FGM team also monitors timely submission of IDEA application, budgets, expenditures, and data that affects funding. A risk assessment rubric has been developed that will assign a score for each of these factors and serve as the determination for which LEAs/SOPs will move to Tier II.

> **Tier II**: IDEA fiscal desk audits are completed for all LEAs and SOPs on a three (3) year cycle. Desk audits include a review of documentation on: time and effort; equipment and inventory; maintenance of fiscal effort; and excess cost. Other inherent risk factors are taken into consideration, such as single audit findings, turnover in leadership in key

positions, agency-wide risk assessment, and date of last onsite monitoring visit. LEAs and SOPs are required to submit policies and procedures, tracking records, examples of fiscal templates, calculation worksheets, and expenditure reports to verify calculation amounts. Each LEA and SOP is notified of the final review from OSES within ninety (90) days of receipt of the final audit documentation from the LEA or SOP. A risk assessment rubric has been developed that will assign a score for each of these factors and serve as the determination for which LEAs/SOPs will move to Tier III.

Tier III: Each year, ten to thirteen (10–13) LEAs and/or SOPs are selected for an on-site IDEA fiscal monitoring visit by random selection and risk-based criteria. The on-site fiscal monitoring visit includes an in-depth review of: time and effort, equipment and inventory, contracted services, maintenance of effort, and parentally-placed private school children and proportionate share records. Summary reports of non-compliance are issued to the LEAs and SOPs sixty (60) days after all submitted documents are reviewed and finalized. LEAs and SOPs are required to respond to the OSES with a correction and ongoing improvement plan (COIP) within ninety (90) days of receiving the OSES's non-compliance letter.

A detailed description of the SCDE's IDEA fiscal monitoring and additional information regarding the SCDE's procedures on applications for, and disbursement of, IDEA funds are included in the Procedures Manual for Utilization of IDEA Funds, which is available on the OSES website at http://ed.sc.gov/districts-schools/special-education-services/fiscal-and-data-management-fdm/fiscal-monitoring/

Allendale:

Description	LEA 15–16	LEA 16–17	LEA 17–18
Compliance Scoring			
Data Submissions	NA	3	3
Finance Submissions	NA	3	3
Post-secondary Planning & Services	NA	2	2
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	NA	3	3
IDEA Timelines	NA	3	3
Total Compliance		14	14
Performance Scoring			
Graduation Rate	69.2	30.0	50.0
ELA	6.3	6.7	2.3
Math	3.1	5.0	6.7
School-Age LRE	29.0	25.4	22.5
Preschool LRE	27.3	46.2	61.5
Suspensions	33.1	35.0	28.8
Career Readiness	25.0	25.0	40.0

Total Performance	NA	3	9
Total scores	NA	17	23
Determination	NA	**Needs Intervention**	**Needs Assistance**

Narrative:

When looking at the district's performance, Allendale has met requirements the past two years in the areas of timely data and finance submissions, corrections of non-compliance, and timelines measured in the State Performance Plan.

Improvement across three years was noted in the areas of performance of students with disabilities on the statewide math proficiency, in preschool least restrictive environment, and in career readiness. Allendale was identified as "Needs Intervention" for the 2016–17 school year based primarily on the district's performance outcome factors. A district team made up of district administrators (both general and special education) as well as school representatives used the Success Gaps Rubric to identify root causes for the achievement and performance gaps and then developed a district action plan to address the issues. Hard work and commitment to addressing these gaps has led the district to increase performance noted below. The district's hard work and commitment to addressing these gaps resulted in the increased in performance noted above.

The most recent on-site program review under the IDEA occurred in November 2017. Findings of noncompliance were consistent with issues identified in other districts. The SCDE, OSES, provided technical assistance in the areas of noncompliance immediately following the on-site visit and continued providing support as the district worked to correct the issues. All findings of noncompliance were corrected by February 2019. In the area of dispute resolution, Allendale has no open state complaints or corrective actions.

Florence 4:

Description	LEA 15–16	LEA 16–17	LEA 17–18
Compliance Scoring			
Data Submissions	NA	3	3
Finance Submissions	NA	2	1
Post-secondary Planning & Services	NA	2	2
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	NA	1	1
IDEA Timelines	NA	2	3
Total Compliance		10	10
Performance Scoring			
Graduation Rate	40.0	50.0	62.5
ELA	1.6	0.0	0.0
Math	4.8	1.5	3.1
School-Age LRE	41.1	47.3	53.7

Preschool LRE	37.5	75.0	40.0
Suspensions	34.1	28.5	27.3
Career Readiness	33.3	0.0	25.0
Total Performance	NA	9	7
Total scores	NA	19	17
Determination	NA	**Needs Assistance**	**Needs Intervention**

Narrative:
When looking at the district's performance, Florence 4 has met requirements the past two years in the area of timely data submissions; improvement has been noted in the area of IDEA timelines. The district continues to struggle with timely finance submissions and timely correction of noncompliance.

Improvement across three years was noted in the areas of performance of students with disabilities on graduation, in school-age least restrictive environment, and in suspensions. Slippage was noted in the areas of ELA performance and career readiness. Inconsistent performance was noted in the areas of math performance on the statewide accountability measure and preschool least restrictive environment.

Florence 4 was identified as "Needs Assistance" for the 2016–17 school year based on both the district's compliance and performance outcome factors. Due to the slippage noted, the district was identified as "Needs Intervention" based on the 2017–18 data. The district will be required to work with OSES staff to identify a district team made up of district administrators (both general and special education) as well as school representatives to use the Success Gaps Rubric to identify root causes for the achievement and performance gaps and then develop a district action plan to address the issues.

The most recent on-site program review under the IDEA occurred in November 2016. The OSES provided technical assistance in the areas of noncompliance immediately following the on-site visit and continued providing support as the district worked to correct the issues. In addition, the OSES covered costs for a consultant to assist the district with the organization of its finance records and student records, which were in considerable disarray. The technical assistance has included frequent professional learning opportunities (both face-to-face and virtual) on-site, via regional and statewide conferences and trainings, and via webinars. The technical assistance continues, based on the district's data as well as upon requests by the district. On average, technical assistance has been provided in some format at least twice a month. The OSES has worked closely with staff from the district and from the SCDE, Office of School Transformation (OST), to identify needs and provide targeted support.

The shared services agreement with Florence School District 1 has also been of benefit to the district. Prior to the change in district staff after the takeover, the district had been unable to correct the findings of noncompliance. However, due to the hard work and commitment of the current district staff and Florence 1 special education staff, as well as OSES and OST staff, all

findings of noncompliance, both systemic and at the individual student levels, were corrected by July 2019.

In the area of dispute resolution, Florence 4 has been able to close one of the two long-standing open corrective actions related to state complaints. The second corrective action has been partially closed and district staff are working hard to fulfill all corrective actions.

Florence 4 has submitted an annual self-assessment questionnaire that includes general questions about pertinent fiscal policies and procedures that should be in place. The district has also submitted an annual Maintenance of Effort (MOE) compliance worksheet for the prior year to ensure that the LEA/SOP has met the MOE compliance standard. Based on the information submitted during the 2017–18 year, the district was determined to be at risk based on its policies and procedures regarding MOE, timely expenditure of IDEA funds, Maintenance of State Financial Support (MFS) expenditures, and the overall agency risk. This moved the district into the second tier for monitoring and resulted in a desk audit for the district. Based on the results for the Tier 2 desk audit and findings noted, the district's risk status was elevated to Tier 3 (an on-site visit). The district is addressing all identified issues with the assistance of Florence 1 through the shared services agreement.

Williamsburg:

Description	LEA 15–16	LEA 16–17	LEA 17–18
Compliance Scoring			
Data Submissions	NA	3	3
Finance Submissions	NA	0	1
Post-secondary Planning & Services	NA	0	2
Timely Correction of Noncompliance	NA	0	1
IDEA Timelines	NA	2	3
Total Compliance		5	10
Performance Scoring			
Graduation Rate	37.0	37.8	38.2
ELA	3.7	4.3	10.6
Math	3.7	4.1	6.9
School-Age LRE	52.0	57.1	53.7
Preschool LRE	61.1	75.0	58.1
Suspensions	9.7	28.8	38.1
Career Readiness	16.7	6.7	14.0
Total Performance	NA	9	8
Total scores	NA	14	18
Determination	NA	**Needs Intervention**	**Needs Intervention**

Narrative:
When looking at the district's performance, Williamsburg has met requirements the past two years in the area of timely data submissions; improvement was noted in the area of IDEA timelines.

Improvement across three years was noted in the areas of performance of students with disabilities on graduation rate and both the statewide ELA and math proficiency. Significant slippage was noted in the areas of suspensions. Consistent performance was noted in the areas of school-age and preschool least restrictive environment.

Williamsburg was identified as "Needs Intervention" for both the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. However, it should be noted that the district's score of 18 was one point below the "Needs Assistance" category. A district team made up of district administrators (both general and special education) as well as school representatives used the Success Gaps Rubric to identify root causes for the achievement and performance gaps and then developed a district action plan to address the issues. The district's hard work and commitment to addressing these gaps resulted in the increased in performance noted above. The district will continue to address the issues noted.

The most recent on-site program review under the IDEA occurred in June 2015.Significant violations were noted. The OSES provided technical assistance in the areas of noncompliance immediately following the on-site visit and continued providing support as the district worked to correct the issues. This technical assistance has included frequent professional learning opportunities on-site, via regional and statewide conferences and trainings, and via webinars. The technical assistance has been provided based on the district's data as well as upon request by the district. On average, technical assistance has been provided in some format at least monthly. The OSES has worked closely with staff from the district and from the OST to identify needs and provide targeted support. Prior to the change in district staff after the takeover, the district had made slow progress, and had been unable to correct the majority of the findings of noncompliance. However, due to the hard work and commitment of the current staff, all findings of noncompliance, both systemic and at the individual student levels, were corrected by June 2019.

In the area of dispute resolution, Williamsburg has been able to close one of the two long-standing open corrective actions related to state complaints. The second corrective action has been partially closed and district staff are working hard to fulfill all corrective actions.

In the area of fiscal and grants management, based on monitoring of the district in June 2016, the district had findings in the following areas: inadequate inventory tracking system, time and effort documentation, written policies and procedures, verification of contractual services, and failure to meet MOE. The findings were not corrected in a timely manner as required by statute and so in March 2017, the district had to pay back funding due to the failure to meet MOE. In April 2017, the district was required to redirect 25 percent of its IDEA funds due to systemic, longstanding, uncorrected, noncompliance. The district was required to hire consultants in both fiscal and programmatic areas to assist in correction of this noncompliance.

As with programmatic noncompliance, the OSES has worked with the Office of School Transformation and the outside consultants to assist the district not only in the correction of the noncompliance, but also in the building of infrastructure to ensure the sustainability of these policies, procedures, and practices. The district's commitment under the new leadership has contributed to slow, but steady progress in the fiscal area as well.

Williamsburg has submitted an annual self-assessment questionnaire that includes general questions about pertinent fiscal policies and procedures that should be in place. The district has also submitted an annual MOE compliance worksheet for the prior year to ensure that the LEA/SOP has met the MOE compliance standard. Based on the information submitted during the 2017–18 year, the district was determined to continue to be at risk based on its policies and procedures regarding MOE, timely expenditure of IDEA funds, MFS expenditures, and the overall agency risk. This moved the district into the second tier for monitoring and resulted in a desk audit for the district. Based on the results for the Tier 2 desk audit, the district showed enough progress and sustainability of previous corrections that there was no need to escalate the district to Tier 3.

Please let me know if there is any additional information the agency may be able to provide. I look forward to continuing to work with the Committee through the remainder of the Legislative Oversight process.

Sincerely,

Molly M. Spearman
State Superintendent of Education

MMS/kn

Enclosures:
VirtualSC Online Teaching Standards
VirtualSC Teaching Load Guidelines 2019–20

VirtualSC Online Teaching Standards

Virtual SC's (VSC) Online Teaching Standards 2.0 is a series of professional practice "standards" for instruction. The goal of VSC's online teaching standards is to visit and reflect with teachers in order to help create responsive, authentic, flexible, and student- centered online learning experiences. While not all "standards" apply equally to all courses at VirtualSC, teachers are still expected to meet all applicable requirements. Please also note, VSC's professional practice "standards" for instruction will look different at different developmental stages for each teacher. Adapted from *SC Teaching Standards 4.0*

Instruction

	Exceeds Mastery (4)	Mastery (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Presenting Instructional Content	Presentation of content always includes: ▢ Providing models (student or teacher) of acceptable and exceptional work to demonstrate teacher's performance expectations in each unit. ▢ Clarifying ambiguous assignment instructions before, during, and/ or after assignments are given using videos, email, messaging, etc. to clarify misunderstandings and making corrections on the course form.	Presentation of content most of the time includes: ▢ Providing models (student or teacher) of acceptable and exceptional work to demonstrate teacher's performance expectations in each unit. ▢ Clarifying ambiguous assignment instructions before, during, and/ or after assignments are given using videos, email, messaging, etc.to clarify misunderstandings.	Presentation of content sometimes includes: ▢ Providing models (student or teacher) of acceptable and exceptional work to demonstrate teacher's performance expectations in each unit. ▢ Rarely clarifying ambiguous assignment instructions before, during, and/ or after assignments are given to clarify misunderstandings.	Presentation of content rarely or does not include: ▢ Providing models (student or teacher) of acceptable and exceptional work to demonstrate teacher's performance expectations in each unit. ▢ Clarifying ambiguous assignment instructions before, during, and/ or after assignments are given using videos, email, messaging, etc.to clarify misunderstandings.
Lesson Structure and Pacing	▢ Pacing is appropriate for all students, and always provides many opportunities (i.e. modification of due dates or providing extensions for IEPs, medical issues, allowing accelerated rate progression, etc.) for individual students who progress at different learning rates with late work accepted to encourage mastery.	▢ Pacing is appropriate for most students, and generally provides opportunities (i.e. modification of due dates or providing extensions for IEPs, medical issues, etc.) for individual students who progress at different learning rates with late work accepted to encourage mastery.	▢ Pacing is appropriate for some students, and rarely provides opportunities (i.e. modification of due dates) or providing extensions for IEPs, medical issues, etc.) for individual students who progress at different learning rates with late work accepted to encourage mastery.	▢ Pacing is appropriate for a few students, and does not provide opportunities for (i.e. modification of due dates) or providing extensions for IEPs, medical issues, etc.) for individual students who progress at different learning rates with late work accepted to encourage mastery.
Resources and Materials	Resources and materials include all of the following within the lesson when students are struggling, for clarification, differentiation, scaffolding, or enhancement: ▢ Incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts that support the lesson objectives (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, websites, open source, etc.). ▢ Teacher modifies resources and materials as necessary to meet the needs of individual students. ▢ Teacher supplies additional resources/materials on an as-needed basis (videos, charts, and other supplementary materials to aid student learning. ▢ Provide students with choices.	Resources and materials include most of the following within the lesson when students are struggling, for clarification, differentiation, scaffolding, or enhancement: ▢ Incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts that support the lesson objectives (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc.). ▢ Teacher modifies resources and materials as necessary to meet the needs of individual students. ▢ Teacher supplies additional resources/materials on an as-needed basis (videos, charts, and other supplementary materials to aid student learning. ▢ Provide students with choices.	Resources and materials include some of the following within the lesson when students are struggling, for clarification, differentiation, scaffolding, or enhancement: ▢ Incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts that support the lesson (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc.). ▢ Teacher modifies resources and materials as necessary to meet the needs of individual students. ▢ Teacher supplies additional resources/materials on an as-needed basis (videos, charts, and other supplementary material to aid student learning. ▢ Does not provide students with choices.	Resources and materials include few of the following within the lesson when students are struggling, for clarification, differentiation, scaffolding, or enhancement: ▢ Incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts that support the lesson (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, etc.). ▢ Teacher modifies resources and materials as necessary to meet the needs of individual students. ▢ Teacher supplies additional resources/materials on an as-needed basis (videos, charts, and other supplementary material to aid student learning. ▢ Does not provide students with choices.
Motivating Students	▢ The teacher consistently reinforces and rewards efforts through announcements and PLDs. ▢ Teacher consistently fosters a growth mindset through messages, shout outs,, posting student work, newsletters, etc.	▢ The teacher regularly reinforces and rewards effort. ▢ Teacher regularly fosters a growth mindset through messages, shout outs on course page, posting student work, newsletters, etc. ▢ Teacher regularly encourages students to	▢ The teacher sometimes reinforces and rewards effort. ▢ Teacher sometimes fosters a growth mindset through messages, shout outs on course page, posting student work, newsletters, etc.	▢ The teacher rarely or does not reinforce and rewards effort. ▢ Teacher rarely or does not foster a growth mindset through messages shout outs on course page, posting student work, newsletters, etc.

	▫ Teacher always encourages students to learn from mistakes with opportunities to redo, individualized conversations to address issues, etc.	learn from mistakes with opportunities to redo, individualized conversations to address issues, etc.	▫ Teacher sometimes encourages students to learn from mistakes with opportunities to redo, individualized conversations to address issues, etc.	▫ Teacher creates or facilitates an environment where mistakes and failure are not viewed as learning experiences.
	Exceeds Mastery (4)	**Mastery (3)**	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Unsatisfactory (1)**
Questioning	Supplemental teacher questions (in feedback, forums, and in other teacher/student interactions, etc.) are varied and high quality providing a consistently balanced mix of question types: 　o knowledge and comprehension, 　o application and analysis, and 　o creation and evaluation. ▫ Questions are always purposeful and coherent. ▫ A high frequency of questions is asked as a supplement to activities to guide instruction. ▫ Students frequently generate higher order questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning as applicable. ▫ Questions are always probing and encourage substantive and deep conversation as found in forums, Live Sessions, activity feedback, and/or e-mail/Genius messages, phone calls, and texts). ▫ Wait time (time before the teacher gives input or answers questions) is consistently provided in activities that require student responses and interaction (i.e. forums, Live Sessions, Interpersonal Tasks, Performance Tasks) as applicable.	Supplemental teacher questions (in feedback, forums, and in other teacher/student interactions, etc.) are varied and high quality providing a balanced mix of question types: 　o knowledge and comprehension, 　o application and analysis, and 　o creation and evaluation. ▫ Questions are regularly purposeful and coherent. ▫ A moderate frequency of questions asked as a supplement to activities and to guide instruction. ▫ Students sometimes generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning as applicable. ▫ Questions are mostly probing and encourage substantive and deep conversation as found in forums, Live Sessions, feedback, and/or e-mail/Genius messages, phone calls, and texts). ▫ Wait time (time before the teacher gives input or answers questions) is often provided in activities that require student responses and interaction (i.e. forums, Live Sessions, and Interpersonal Tasks, Performance Tasks) as applicable.	Supplemental teacher questions (in feedback, forums, and in other teacher/student interactions, etc.) are varied and high quality providing for some, but not all, question types: 　o knowledge and comprehension, 　o application and analysis, and 　o creation and evaluation. ▫ Questions are sometimes purposeful and coherent. ▫ A low frequency of questions asked as a supplement to activities and to guide instruction.. ▫ Students rarely generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning as applicable. ▫ Questions are somewhat probing and encourage substantive and deep conversation as found in forums, Live Sessions, feedback, and/or e-mail/Genius messages, phone calls, and texts). ▫ Wait time (time before the teacher gives input or answers questions) is sometimes provided in activities that require student responses and interaction (i.e. forums, Live Sessions, and Interpersonal Tasks, Performance Tasks) as applicable.	Supplemental teacher questions (in feedback, forums, and in other teacher/student interactions, etc.) are inconsistent in quality and include few question types: 　o knowledge and comprehension, 　o application and analysis, and 　o creation and evaluation. ▫ Questions, if any, are random and lack coherence. ▫ No questions are asked as a supplement to activities and to guide instruction. ▫ Students do not generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning as applicable. ▫ Questions are rarely probing and encourage substantive and deep conversation as found in forums, Live Sessions, feedback, and/or e-mail/Genius messages, phone calls, and texts). ▫ Wait time (time before the teacher gives input or answers questions) is inconsistently provided in activities that require student responses and interaction (i.e. forums, Live Sessions, and Interpersonal Tasks, Performance Tasks) as applicable.
Academic Feedback	▫ Feedback observed is academically focused, personalized, and high quality on rubrics, via messages, calls or when prompted by student. ▫ Feedback from students, course surveys, or teacher generated surveys is used to monitor and adjust any subsequent remediated or enriched instruction. ▫ Teacher always encourages students to utilize feedback in re-attempting content and skill mastery or with enriching content mastered (i.e. remediation). ▫ Teacher always provides feedback to all students, those who have and have not mastered. ▫ *Teacher frequently engages students in giving specific and high quality feedback to one another in response forums in initial credit courses.*	▫ Feedback observed is academically focused and high quality on rubrics. ▫ Feedback from students, course surveys, or teacher generated surveys is used to monitor and adjust any subsequent remediated or enriched instruction. ▫ Teacher regularly encourages students to utilize feedback in re-attempting content and skill mastery or with enriching content mastered (i.e. remediation). ▫ Teacher provides feedback to most students, those who have and have not mastered. ▫ *Teacher does engage students in giving specific and high quality feedback to one another in response forums.*	▫ Feedback observed is generic and not academically focused or high quality ▫ Feedback is given to those students who either have or have not mastered but not both. ▫ Feedback from students, course surveys, or teacher generated surveys is not used to monitor and adjust instruction. ▫ Teacher rarely encourages students to utilize feedback in re-attempting content and skill mastery or with enriching content mastered (i.e. remediation). ▫ *Teacher does not engage students in giving specific and high quality feedback to one another in response forums.*	▫ There was no teacher feedback available for any students. ▫ Feedback from students is not utilized.

Teacher Content Knowledge	▢ As a supplement, teacher implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge (i.e. logged individualized conversation, messages, tutorial sessions, etc.). ▢ Limited content is taught in sufficient depth to allow for the development of understanding (add content where needed).	▢ As a supplement, teacher implements subject- specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge (i.e. logged individualized conversation, messages, tutorial sessions, etc.).	▢ As a supplement, teacher rarely implements a subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.	▢ Teacher does not implement subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.

	Exceeds Mastery (4)	Mastery (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Teacher Knowledge of Students	▢ Teacher displays a deep understanding of each student's anticipated learning difficulties and struggles by frequently employing a variety of methods to assist (i.e. weekly email tips, videos demonstrating fixes, help forum posts, one to one, Live Sessions, etc.). ▢ Teacher frequently provides methods to differentiate instruction and content ensuring students have the opportunity to master what is being taught (i.e. BB Ultra reteach session, assignment re-do, Help forum, etc.).	▢ Teacher displays an understanding of students' anticipated learning difficulties and struggles by regularly employing a couple strategies to assist (i.e. weekly email tips, videos demonstrating fixes, help forum posts, one to one, Live Sessions, etc.). ▢ Teacher regularly provides methods to differentiate instruction and content ensuring students have the opportunity to master what is being taught (i.e. weekly email tips, videos demonstrating fixes, help forum posts, use of BB Ultra, Help Forum, etc.).	▢ Teacher displays a minimal understanding of students' anticipated learning difficulties and struggles by infrequently employing one strategy to assist. ▢ Teacher minimally provides methods to differentiate instruction and content ensuring students have the opportunity to master what is being taught.	▢ Teacher does not display an understanding of students' learning difficulties and struggles by not employing strategies to assist ▢ Teacher does not differentiate instruction and content ensuring students have the opportunity to master what is being taught.
Grouping Students	▢ *The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual) consistently maximize student understanding and learning efficiency as applicable.* ▢ *All students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.* ▢ *All students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.* ▢ *Instructional groups facilitate opportunities for students to set goals, reflect on, and evaluate their learning.* ▢ *Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to best accomplish the goals of the lesson.**	▢ *The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual) adequately enhance student understanding and learning efficiency as applicable.* ▢ *Most students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.* ▢ *Most students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.* ▢ *Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to most of the time, accomplish the goals of the lesson. **	▢ *Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to sometime, accomplish the goals of the lesson.**	▢ *Instructional group composition remains unchanged irrespective of the learning, and instructional goals of a lesson. **
Expectations	▢ Teacher sets high and challenging academic expectations for every student using personalized feedback, weekly messages, etc. ▢ Teacher frequently creates learning opportunities where all students can experience success through the use of supplemental resources, personalized feedback, and weekly messages. ▢ Teacher frequently monitors whether students are following recommendations	▢ Teacher sets high and challenging academic expectations for most students using personalized feedback, weekly messages, etc. ▢ Teacher regularly creates learning opportunities where most students can experience success through the use of supplemental resources, personalized feedback, and weekly messages. ▢ Teacher regularly monitors whether students are following recommendations given in feedback and follows up with the student,	▢ Teacher sets high and challenging academic expectations for some students using personalized feedback, weekly messages, etc. ▢ Teacher creates some learning opportunities where some students can experience success through the use of supplemental resources, personalized feedback, and weekly messages. ▢ Teacher minimally monitors whether students are following recommendations given	▢ Teacher expectations cannot be found for any student through the use of personalized feedback, weekly messages, etc. ▢ Teacher does not create learning opportunities, using supplemental resources, where some students can experience success through the use of supplemental resources, personalized feedback, and weekly messages. ▢ Teacher does not monitor whether students are following recommendations given in

	given in feedback and follows up with the student, parent and SC as needed to ensure that the student's support network is aware of the issue. ☐ *Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and makes attempts to facilitate better performance from every student.* *	parent and SC as needed to ensure that the student's support network is aware of the issue.	in feedback and follows up with the student, parent and SC as needed to ensure that the student's support network is aware of the issue.	feedback and follows up with the student, parent and SC as needed to ensure that the student's support network is aware of the issue.

Environment

	Exceeds Mastery (4)	Mastery (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Managing Student Behavior	☐ Teacher clearly establishes, communicates, and frequently reinforces the rules and expectations for learning and behavior (i.e. AIV policy, syllabus, rubrics, forum, Live Sessions procedures, etc.). ☐ The teacher attends to disruptions quickly, firmly and consistently with no interruption to instruction.	☐ Teacher clearly establishes, communicates, and regularly reinforces rules and expectations for learning and behavior (i.e. AIV policy, syllabus, rubrics, forum, Live Sessions procedures, etc.). ☐ The teacher attends to disruptions firmly and consistently with minimal interruption to instruction.	☐ Teacher establishes and/or communicates rules and expectations for learning and behavior (i.e. AIV policy, rubrics, forum, Live Sessions procedures, etc.). ☐ The teacher inconsistently deals with students who have caused disruptions, and frequently addresses the entire class.	☐ Teacher's expectations for learning and behavior are not established or communicated to the students and cannot be found in the course. ☐ Disruptions frequently interrupt instruction.
Environment	The course ☐ is very personalized reflecting teacher personality and is always updated (i.e. announcement block, Linoit board, welcome message, websites for students/parents, culturally relevant, unit pictures, PLDs, etc.). ☐ is consistently arranged to promote individual and group learning. ☐ displays student work and/or student celebrations (birthdays, top scores, most improved, etc.) that frequently changes.	The course ☐ is personalized reflecting teacher personality and is often updated (i.e. announcement block, Linoit board, welcome message, websites for students/parents, culturally relevant, unit pictures, etc.). ☐ all course modifications are easily and readily accessible. ☐ is arranged to promote individual and group learning. ☐ displays student work and/ or student celebrations (birthdays, top scores, most improved, etc.) that occasionally changes.	The course ☐ is minimally personalized from master copy, barely reflects the teacher's personality, and is minimally updated. ☐ some course modifications are easily and readily accessible, others are not working. ☐ is somewhat arranged to promote individual and group learning. ☐ displays student work and/or student celebrations (birthdays, top scores, most improved, etc.) that rarely changes.	The course ☐ is not personalized from master copy, does not reflect the teacher's personality, and is never updated. ☐ course modifications are inaccessible. ☐ does not display student work and/or student celebrations (birthdays, top scores, most improved, etc.).
Respectful Culture	☐ Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for one another (in forum responses, feedback, Genius, texts, and email). ☐ Teacher seeks out, and is always receptive to the interests and opinions of all students while also exhibiting mutual respect and politeness (i.e. offers options for forum responses/ assignments, including student interests in comments/feedback). ☐ Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the course. ☐ Students always exhibit respect and politeness in how they address the teacher and each other as applicable.	☐ Teacher-student interactions are mostly friendly and respectful, but may reflect occasional inconsistencies. ☐ Teacher is often receptive to the interests and opinions of students while also exhibiting mutual respect and politeness (i.e. offers options for forum responses/ assignments, including student interests in comments/feedback). ☐ Students often exhibit respect and politeness in how they address the teacher and each other as applicable.	☐ Teacher-student interactions are sometimes friendly, but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, reflects favoritism, or disregard for students' cultures. ☐ Teacher is sometimes receptive to the interests and opinions of students while also exhibiting mutual respect and politeness. ☐ Students rarely exhibit respect and politeness in how they address the teacher and each other as applicable.	☐ Teacher-student interactions are negative, inconsistent, reflects favoritism, a disregard for students' cultures, is inappropriate, sarcastic, and/or conflicts are not deesculated. ☐ Teacher is not receptive to interests and opinions of students and does not exhibit mutual respect and politeness. ☐ Students never exhibit respect and politeness in how they address the teacher and each other as applicable.

(*Italicized** items are pending expectations) 8/14/19

Professionalism					
	Performance Standard	**Exceeds Mastery (4)**	**Mastery (3)**	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Unsatisfactory (1)**
Growing and Developing Professionally	1. The educator is prompt, prepared, and participates in professional development meetings, bringing student artifacts (student work) when requested.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	2. The educator appropriately attempts to implement new learning in the classroom following presentation in professional development meetings.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	3. The educator selects specific activities, content knowledge, or pedagogical skills to enhance and improve his/her proficiency.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	4. The educator develops and works on his or her professional growth objectives for new learning based on analyses of school improvement plans and new goals, self-assessment, and input from the teacher leader and principal observations.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	5. The educator attends mandatory PD and training sessions as applicable.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	6. The educator attends optional PD and training sessions as applicable.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	7. The educator attends mandatory faculty meetings.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	8. The educator attends optional faculty meetings.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
Reflecting on Teaching	9 The educator makes thoughtful and accurate assessments of his/her lessons' effectiveness as evidenced by the self-reflection after each observation.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	10. The educator offers specific actions to improve his/her teaching.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	11. The educator accepts responsibilities contributing to school improvement.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	12. The educator utilizes student achievement data to address strengths and weaknesses of students and guide instructional decisions.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
Managing Courses	13. Prior to the start of the course, the educator familiarizes self with course content and ensures all components are working.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	14. The educator sends a welcome message via Genius and the student's and parent's personal email addresses which includes information on course pacing, expectations, and access, and information on how all future messages will be sent and received to everyone at the beginning of the semester (CP) or on the first day of enrollment (CR).	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	15. The educator provides an accurate pacing guide and correct link to the course syllabus in the Course Information section of each course in Moodle.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	16. The educator replies to students, parents/guardians, sponsors, and VSC staff and faculty within one business day of published office hours.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	17. The educator adopts an appropriate and professional tone in all communication with students.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	18. WNS, WNG, and WAV policies and dates are followed and reinforced.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	19. The educator acknowledges and records all communication in Genius and records all external contact in the Notes section of Genius.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	20. The educator creates, tags for captioning, and uploads an educator introduction video into each course taught.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely

	21. The educator grades all assignments, tests, etc. in a timely manner with grades being posted for viewing by students, parents/guardians, sponsors, and staff within 72 office hours of assignment submission.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	22. The educator sends students and parents/guardians weekly written communication about students' progress in their course(s), to describe upcoming deadlines, give advice on specific assignments, etc.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	23. If students are taking CP courses for which there is an EOC exam, the educator sends written notice to the students, parents/guardians, and sponsors at the beginning of the course explaining the state requirements and procedures for taking the exams.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
	24. The educator is working and accessible to students, parents/guardians, sponsors, and VSC staff and faculty during their posted office hours.	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely

(*Italicized* items are pending expectations) 8/14/19

VirtualSC Teaching Load Guidelines 2019-2020

Enrollment in each section is determined by the course the teacher is teaching as outlined in the following tier system:

Tier	Section Cap	Courses
Tier 1	25	**All AP Courses** **World Languages:** Accelerated Spanish Courses; Latin 4 Honors
Tier 2	35	**CATE**: Introduction to Career Clusters **English:** English 1-4; English 1-4 Honors **Fine Arts:** Art History Honors; Media Arts 1 **Math:** Algebra 1, Geometry, Probability and Statistics **Science:** Chemistry, Physics, Astronomy Honors **Social Studies:** US History **World Languages:** Exploring World Languages in SC; French 1-2; German 1-2, German 3 Honors; Mastery Spanish 1-3 CP; Mastery Spanish 3 H; Spanish 4 Honors; Latin 1a and 1b, Latin 2, Latin 3 Honors
Tier 3	45	**CATE:** Fundamentals of Web Page Design and Development; Integrated Business Applications; Health Science 3; Entrepreneurship; Personal Finance; Family Life Education; Child Development; IT Fundamentals **Fine Arts:** Music Appreciation **Math:** Algebra 2, Foundations in Algebra, Intermediate Algebra, Precalculus **Science:** Biology, Environmental Science, Physical Science, Earth Science, Forensic Science, Anatomy and Physiology **Social Studies:** Economics, Government, Psychology, Sociology, World Geography, World History **World Languages:** Latin 1, (year-long with language coaches)

Tier 4	**65**	**CATE:** Accounting 1; Health Science 1; Medical Terminology; Parenting Education **Health/Physical Education:** Personal Health; Physical Education I
Tier 5	**81**	**Credit Recovery: English** (all courses)**; Math** (Algebra 1, 2 and Geometry); **Social Studies** (Government, Economics and U.S. History); **Science** (Earth Science, Biology and Chemistry)