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World Class Knowledge
- Rigorous standards in language arts and math for career and college readiness
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- Creativity and innovation
- Critical thinking and problem solving
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- Global perspective
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- Work ethic
- Interpersonal skills
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"Too many kids go beyond the third grade without a critical foundation in place. When that happens, our educational system fails them, and it’s high time we stop it." -- Sen. Harvey Peeler, Read to Succeed Legislative Leader

"The measures used to determine how well our children are prepared for the 21st century will require more than just snapshots of how students perform on achievement measures of knowledge within K-12. The system must also account for measures of skills and opportunity, as well as how students perform once they graduate from high school." -- David Whittemore, EOC Chairman
EARLY LITERACY ASSESSMENT AND INTERVENTION

A great deal of the work the EOC has been doing regarding literacy has hinged on a commitment to early literacy. Children with substantially underdeveloped language and literacy skills should be identified as early as possible and provided with language and literacy supports before their needs become too great. This can be done, but only by well-trained staff implementing proven-effective language and literacy practices. Unfortunately, many existing family literacy, child care, Head Start, and preschool programs have insufficiently trained staff using practices that are less than proven-effective.

READ TO SUCCEED

This landmark education legislation passed by the General Assembly in 2014 hinges on identification of and effective interventions for students who have reading difficulties procured earlier. As a result of the legislation, an early literacy assessment was procured and school districts were required to administer it within the first 45 days of school for all students in publicly funded 4K and 5K programs.

In February 2014, the EOC released “When the Bough Breaks,” a documentary produced by Bud Ferillo at the USC Children’s Law Center. Through interviews with experts and practitioners, the video focuses on the importance of language and reading on the brain development of infants, the need for K-12 students to have access to materials and teachers trained in diagnosing and intervening when students have reading difficulties, as well as the role reading has on the economic development of SC.

ASSESSMENT OF EARLY LITERACY

On June 30, 2014, the EOC forwarded the State Board of Education characteristics of an early readiness assessment to measure the early literacy and language development of all four and five year-olds enrolled in a publicly funded program during the first 45 days of the 2014-15 school year (Proviso 1A.76. of the 2014-15 General Appropriation Act). The EOC also advised the General Assembly on how to reallocate existing funds to pay for the statewide assessment.

The kindergarten class of 2014-15 is the first cohort of students who could be retained for being significantly below reading proficiency in the 3rd grade in school year 2017-18.

Last session, the General Assembly enacted the Read to Succeed legislation that addresses the importance of early identification and intervention of struggling readers, of teacher preparation and training, and of parental involvement and community support to systemically improve reading achievement. Furthermore, the General Assembly expanded the Child Development Education Pilot Program (CDEPP). Any four-year-old who qualifies for the free or reduced price Federal lunch program and/or Medicaid and who resides in a school district where the poverty index is at least 70 percent or more is eligible to participate in a full-day education program in a public or private center at no cost. The legislature also addressed the importance of a readiness assessment focused on early literacy based on evidence that:

The assessment of emergent literacy skills can serve to identify those children who may be at risk for later reading difficulties. Furthermore, assessment results can guide the content and delivery of early literacy instruction. Failure to identify children early and provide appropriate intervention to promote emergent literacy skills is likely to have serious repercussions for later development of conventional reading skills.

Using a framework that was created by early childhood advocates to evaluate the Child Development Education Pilot Program, the EOC identified key academic and social accomplishments that must be addressed if children are to succeed in kindergarten. Included in these accomplishments are language and literacy skills defined as follows:

Critical language and literacy skills including communication of needs and preferences, listening, receptive and expressive vocabulary, phonological awareness, alphabetic principal and knowledge, print and book knowledge, prewriting and writing skills, and reading comprehension.
The EOC also received input from the following experts:

- Florida Center for Reading Research at Florida State University;
- Florida Just Read! Office;
- Early childhood experts in South Carolina at the school, district, higher education and state levels on the P-20 reading initiative;
- Institute for Child Success in Greenville; and
- First Steps to School Readiness Board of Trustees.

**Characteristics of a readiness assessment focused on literacy**

A readiness assessment administered to children in four-year-old and five-year-old kindergarten which is focused on early language and literacy development should have the following characteristics:

1. The assessment should measure critical language and literacy skills including, but not limited to communication of needs and preferences, listening, receptive and expressive vocabulary, phonological awareness, alphabetic principal and knowledge, print and book knowledge, prewriting and writing skills, and reading comprehension.

2. The assessment must be supported by empirical data or evidence documenting that it measures these critical language and literacy skills and that these competencies are predictive of later reading and writing success.

3. The assessment should provide student-level results that can be used to inform individual literacy instruction by teachers.

4. The assessment should provide student-level results that can assist parents or guardians in providing appropriate support to assist their child’s language development.

5. The assessment should be able to measure student growth from one year to the next, from 4K to 5K, at a minimum.

6. The assessment should provide accommodations for children with disabilities and children who are English language learners.

7. The assessment should give timely, student-level feedback and reports to parents, teachers, schools and the state.

8. The assessment should demonstrate alignment with South Carolina English language arts standards.

9. The assessment should have a well-documented and detailed description of its development and history, including what states use the assessment to guarantee the assessment’s reliability and validity.

10. The assessment should be curriculum neutral and therefore not require the use of any specific early childhood curriculum in the publicly funded prekindergarten or public kindergarten programs.

In addition, based upon the input received, the EOC also recommended to the State Board of Education that vendors responding to the request for proposal be asked to:

- Document the specific components of the assessment, including but not limited to, print awareness and orientation, verbal communication, picture and letter recognition, ability to tell a story, beginning of proper oral word use and sentence structure, alphabetic principle and knowledge, prewriting and writing/pretend, listening/story recall and vocabulary;

- Document the amount of ongoing professional development that can be provided to schools and districts; and

- Document the amount of time that will be required to administer the assessment so that the assessment is respectful of classroom teachers’ time and needs for professional development.
The Executive Director of the Budget and Control Board then procured for the Department of Education by emergency procurement the assessment CIRCLE by Amplify. All four and five-year-olds in public schools in South Carolina and four-year-olds enrolled in the Child Development Education Pilot Program in both public schools and private centers were administered the assessment in fall of 2014.

REPORT OF PUBLICLY FUNDED 4K PROGRAM ISSUED

The South Carolina Education Oversight Committee (EOC) released a report in January 2015 evaluating the Child Development Education Pilot Program (CDEPP), a full-day educational pre-kindergarten program for at-risk four-year-olds. The program, which was written into permanent law as the Child Early Reading Development and Education Program last legislative session, began in 2006 as a pilot program for children residing in the plaintiff districts in the school funding lawsuit, Abbeville County School District et al. vs. SC. The program is implemented in both public and private centers across the state.

According to the report, at-risk four-year-olds residing in 60 school districts are currently eligible to enroll in a program in either a public school or in a private child care center, a significant increase from the 34 eligible school districts in fiscal year 2012-13. The expansion in accessibility comes as a result of the S.C. General Assembly expanding the eligibility criteria in Fiscal year 2013-14 to include districts with a poverty index of 75 percent or more. In fiscal year 2014-15, the General Assembly further expanded the eligibility criteria to include districts with a poverty index of 70 percent or higher. The General Assembly currently funds the full-day, 4K program at $75 million.

The report found that 46 percent of all at-risk four-year-olds statewide are now being served in a publicly funded program, a percentage that also includes children being served by federally funded ABC voucher programs as well as Head Start.

A majority, 86%, of the approximately 12,000 students being served by CDEPP in school year 2014-15, are being served in public schools in 57 school districts. Three CDEPP eligible school districts -- Barnwell 45, Horry, and Union -- chose not to participate in CDEPP during 2014-15. Approximately 144 private providers serve the other 14 percent of students statewide in the program, including students in the eligible, non-participating school districts.

While access to the program has significantly expanded, an analysis of the academic achievement of students participating in the program shows modest improvement in student achievement. While a greater percentage of CDEPP students met or exceeded state standards in ELA and mathematics than did low-income students who resided in the CDEPP districts but who did not participate in the program as four-year-olds, the statewide achievement gap between CDEPP students and all other students in the state is not narrowing, most notably in mathematics.

A follow-up report will be published in mid-2015 to document the initial results of the recently-implemented CIRCLE assessment, which measures early literacy skills.
Eight recommendations are included in the report, which was sent to members of the SC General Assembly. The recommendations follow:

1. While expansion in the state-funded full-day 4K program has occurred, a more integrated, focused effort to leverage existing 4K program opportunities and enhance the quality of current 4K programs opportunities needs to be considered.

2. Statewide, the number of four-year-olds participating in Head Start declined from 6,364 in 2013 to 5,975 in 2014. Consequently, at the state and local levels greater collaboration between the Office of First Steps, the South Carolina Department of Education and the Head Start Collaboration Office must occur to ensure that parents have all relevant information to determine if and which 4K program best serves the individual needs of their children. The evaluation team would recommend all three 4K providers develop a joint, consolidated community outreach strategy that encourages families of students at-risk of school failure to enroll in voluntary full-day quality 4K programs. An example of such collaboration would be the joint publication and distribution of a brochure for families to use in understanding the program and in choosing a provider of services.

3. The evaluation team could not find any statutory authority allowing the expenditure of funds for “advance payments” by the State Office of SC First Steps. To maintain fiscal accountability for the funds appropriated and expended for the program, the evaluation team recommends that the Office of First Steps cease making advance payments and only reimburse for actual services provided.

4. Advancements in quality and improvements in young students’ readiness should be incentivized, utilizing assessment data (for example: individual student growth, classroom environment, teacher:child interaction). At a minimum any private provider participating in state-funded full-day 4K should be required to participate in ABC Quality, a program administered by SC DSS.

5. The Office of First Steps carried forward $4.0 million in FY2013-14 and is projected to carry forward an additional $5.0 million in the current fiscal year. No additional funds should be appropriated to the Office of First Steps for the program, even with the addition of four districts that will be eligible to participate in FY2015-16. Instead, the General Assembly should reduce the full-day 4K appropriation to the Office of First Steps by at least $2.0 million and reallocate those funds to the South Carolina Department of Education. Public schools are serving 86 percent of the four-year-olds in the program but received 73 percent of the total funds appropriated for the program in FY2014-15. South Carolina should invest in improving the quality of CDEPP by addressing staff qualifications, implementation of formal, systematic continuous improvement initiatives with ongoing program monitoring. Program monitoring should include frequent assessments of the classroom environment, including the quality of teacher-child interactions. The evaluation team would point to the school district of Florence 1 as a model.

6. Based upon analysis of SC PASS results, specific attention to the professional development and training of CDEPP teachers in math must be enhanced.

7. When the results of the fall 2014 CIRCLE assessment can be analyzed, the data should be used to reinforce individualized instruction that meets the needs of each CDEPP student in 4K, 5K, 1st and 2nd grades, especially to prepare all students to be on reading level by 3rd grade.

---

**Opportunity for Success Through Innovation**

The Reach Out and Read program works to prepare students to succeed in school by partnering with doctors to prescribe books and encourage families to read together. Doctors, nurse practitioners, and other medical professionals incorporate Reach Out and Read’s evidence-based model into regular pediatric checkups. The evidence base of 15 peer-reviewed research studies shows that during the preschool years, children served by Reach Out and Read score three to six months ahead of their non-Reach Out and Read peers on vocabulary tests.

In its 2015-16 budget recommendations, the EOC was supportive of a new, one-time appropriation of $500,000 to the Reach Out and Read Carolinas program for early literacy. The program, which provides literacy training to medical professionals who treat families of young children, will match the one-time appropriation and focus their efforts on high-poverty, rural areas of SC if funded.
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### Building K-12 Student Success

### 2014 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT REPORT CARD RELEASE

In November, the results of the 14th annual state district and school report cards were released, showing improvement among schools and districts. Forty-two school districts received a rating of Excellent in 2014, compared to only one in 2009. The increase in ratings is consistent with a statewide increase in the on-time graduation rate from 77.5% to 80.1%. The on-time graduation rate accounts for 40 percent of the district’s Absolute Rating on the state report card. However, three school districts received an Absolute Rating of At Risk.

### SC On-Time Graduation Rate, 2009-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020 Goal: 88.3%**

The percentage of students scoring Exemplary on SC PASS increased in the majority of grade levels and content areas, which was a factor in the improvements seen in elementary and middle school ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>% Met or Above 2014</th>
<th>% Met or Above 2013</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Exemplary 2014</th>
<th>% Exemplary 2013</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>+7.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>+9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>+7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>+6.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>+7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>+4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading &amp; Research</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-one percent of students were enrolled in a school rated *Excellent* in 2014, compared to 17 percent of students in 2009. The percentage of students enrolled in a school rated *At Risk* has declined from 5 percent to 3 percent.

The November state report card release marked the end of state ratings for two years as the state prepares for a combined state and federal report card. The “hiatus” for state school and district report card results occurs as a result of Act 200, legislation that passed the SC General Assembly last session.

**SUMMER READING CAMP PILOT STUDY**

In October, the EOC released a report on a study of 20 school districts who participated in a pilot study of summer reading camps in 2014. Act 284, or the Read to Succeed Act, requires all school districts to serve students who are in significant need of intervention during their third grade year beginning Summer 2015. The pilot study involved districts submitting data regarding demographics and reading growth results in the camp in addition to EOC staff observations. Third grade students who participated in the Summer Reading Camp were initially on average 1.7 years below grade level. Upon completion of the camp, these students were 1.3 years behind in reading. Third grade students averaged approximately three weeks of growth for each week of instruction during Summer Reading Camp.

The results of 3.7 months average growth for 3rd graders was below the expected growth of 4 months. However, the rule of thumb approximates it takes five hours in two weeks of additional intervention instruction to achieve one month’s growth.

Of the 2014 SC PASS scores provided by districts for the 2014 summer reading camp students, 31% scored Not Met 1 on SC PASS (lowest level) and 53% scored Not Met 2. A total of 85% of the students in the summer reading camp scored below the Met level in reading.
Districts in the pilot study that produced student reading growth gains above the pilot average implemented their camps in different ways, using varying curriculum, progress monitoring tools, as well as structuring the camps differently. However attributes that appeared to be similar for districts with student reading growth above the pilot average were: highly effective teachers in the program; a focused, intensive approach to teaching and learning; strong community/business partnerships; effective utilization of all staff in the program; engaging, motivating lessons by the teachers; and a strong process for effective progress monitoring of student growth.

### Average student growth in 3rd grade (in years -- all students)

Figure 1. Data demonstrates the growth of 3rd grade student (all students) reading district and the pilot districts average.
EDUCATIONAL CREDIT FOR EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS STUDENTS

The General Assembly requires the EOC to publish on its website the private or independent schools and nonprofit scholarship funding organizations eligible to participate in the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) program. A nonprofit scholarship funding organization can award grants up to $10,000 to cover the cost of tuition, transportation and textbooks to “exceptional needs students” attending eligible, independent schools in South Carolina. The nonprofit scholarship funding organizations receives donations from individuals or corporations. These donations are in turn, eligible for South Carolina income tax credits, up to a maximum of $8.0 million for Fiscal Year 2013-14 if the donations were made on or after January 1, 2014 and $8.0 million in Fiscal Year 2014-15.

To provide additional information to the public and policymakers, the EOC on July 21, 2014 wrote a letter to the five nonprofit funding scholarship organizations asking for the following information for the time period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014:

- Total dollar amount of revenues collected
- Total number of individual and corporate donors
- Total number of applications received
- Total number of applications approved
- Total number of applications denied
- Total number of eligible children awarded grants. “Awarded” is defined as checks being issued on or before June 30, 2014, or similarly, funds allocated or expended for grants by the nonprofit scholarship funding organization for specific individual students
- Total dollar amount of grants awarded and/or allocated
- Total number of eligible schools in which the eligible children were enrolled
- Of any balance of revenues/contributions as of June 30, 2014, what is the total amount of these revenues/contributions that are already obligated to eligible children who have applied for and been approved a grant for the 2014-15 school year?
- If you like to provide any information on the criteria used in approving or denying applications, the EOC would be interested in having the information.
- If you would like to share any information on the applicants (e.g. gender, ethnicity, or educational needs) but without providing personally identifiable information, the EOC would be interesting in having such data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonprofit Scholarship Funding Organizations</th>
<th>Total Revenues Collected</th>
<th>Number of Individual and Corporate Donors</th>
<th>Total Amount of Grants Awarded</th>
<th>Any Revenue Obligated for Scholarships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance Carolina</td>
<td>$78,870</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$75,250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors Enriching Students’ Knowledge (D.E.S.K.)</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Kids FIRST1</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Corporate Coalition for Community Service</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas Aquinas</td>
<td>$1,194,202</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$1,150,297</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$6,005,072</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>$3,535,457</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications and Awards (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonprofit Scholarship Funding Organizations</th>
<th>Number of Applications Received</th>
<th>Number of Applications Approved</th>
<th>Number of Applications Denied</th>
<th>Number of Children Awarded Grants</th>
<th>Number of Eligible Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance Carolina</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors Enriching Students’ Knowledge (D.E.S.K.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Kids FIRST</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Corporate Coalition for Community Service</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas Aquinas</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Palmetto Kids FIRST Data are approximate dollar amounts. As reported by Palmetto Kids FIRST, these “figures may be adjusted slightly upon final CPA audit.” In addition, Palmetto Kids FIRST reported that less than $133,000 was retained for expenses and fees. And, “of the $2.3 million available at the end of the fiscal year, 100% had been awarded in 2014-15 for grants as of August 5, 2014.”
Donors Enriching Students’ Knowledge (D.E.S.K.) explained that one application was denied due to the child not having documentation as being identified as eligible for special education services. In 2013-14 students making application for grants had to have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) issued by a public school district verifying that the child was eligible for special education services. In school year 2014-15 the proviso governing the program was changed to allow children diagnosed by a private provider as needing specialized instruction and services to be eligible for the program as well.

South Carolina Corporate Coalition for Community Service explained that the Coalition’s “interest over the last year has been to educate parents regarding the opportunities for the Scholarships. As such our method has been more methodical and grassroots in nature as we try not to rush children into the program but allow a natural interest of the program through education and awareness that provides parents with the most up to date and thorough information possible.”

The EOC also asked the nonprofit scholarship funding organizations for information about the criteria used in making the grants and demographic information on the grant recipients. The responses appear below:

- Advance Carolina reported that a committee of three individuals makes the final determination. These individuals have no connections to the eligible schools receiving the grants and no children eligible for the grant.
- Donors Enriching Students’ Knowledge (D.E.S.K.) reported that it “looks at the family’s financial ability and the severity of the student’s disability as criteria for a scholarship. DESK prioritizes applicants with the severest educational and financial needs.” An independent panel composed of a former special needs public school teacher of the year and a former deputy superintendent at the South Carolina Department of Education and others review and award the scholarships.
- Palmetto Kids FIRST reported that it “does not collect financial data, but coordinate(s) based on a cooperative ‘honor system’ with our partnered schools to help families in need first. However, our goal is to fund 100% of our eligible ‘special needs’ applicants. We believe families of ‘special needs’ children have extensive medical, personal, time and financial burdens out of just school tuition.”
- St. Thomas Aquinas reported that enough funds were collected “to provide a scholarship to 100% of the applicants at a rate of 90%. In the future, if funding is constrained, we would apply a means test to determine which students were to receive scholarships to a greater extent than others. We would use the company FACTS that already has a contract with our diocesan schools.” St. Thomas Aquinas also reported the following demographic information. Of the 81 applicants
  - 19.7% were minority
  - 33% were female
  - 67% were male

Fiscal Year 2014-15

The General Assembly reauthorized the ECENC Program in the 2014-15 General Appropriation Act through Proviso 1.80. Regarding implementation of the program in Fiscal Year 2014-15, the Education Oversight Committee reports that as of February 1, 2015:

- Ninety-eight schools are eligible to participate in the program. Two schools have been denied participating. One school did not provide the general education program as required by the proviso. The other school was not a member in good standing with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the South Carolina Association of Christian Schools or the South Carolina Independent School Association.
- An Advisory Committee was selected and has met on two occasions. The Committee has recommended: (1) school compliance audits for schools to complete and submit to the Department of Revenue and to the Secretary of State; and (2) the data and format for academic profiles. Each eligible school participating in the program must submit information to the EOC on student assessments and other information that will then be downloaded into an online, academic profile.
Policy and budget recommendations

In December, EOC members adopted budget recommendations for the 2015-16 fiscal year. The programmatic and funding recommendations were designed to accelerate improvements in student and school performance by better preparing students for success in careers or in postsecondary education. Committee members annually make recommendations for the spending of Education Improvement Act (EIA) funds, which are generated by the penny sales tax. In November, the Board of Economic Advisors projected that the EIA will generate $677 million in total revenues in fiscal year 2015-16, an increase of $29.2 million from the current base funding.

Highlights of the recommendations, which were sent to the General Assembly and the Governor for consideration during next year’s legislative session, include:

Technology
- The committee recommended continued funding of $29.3 million for technology, currently funded with lottery monies, as well as an increase of $2.1 million for the K-12 Technology Initiative. The recommended increase is due to the increased bandwidth requirements in school districts and county libraries as well as changes in federal technology funding. There continues to be a need to provide high-capacity wireless access points in schools to handle the expansion of wireless devices currently used to instruct and assess students.

Student College and Career Readiness:
- Funding for new assessments as well as print and digital instructional materials.
- The committee recommended an increase of $4.2 million to cover the cost of the ACT, the college and career readiness test, and WorkKeys, assessments which will be given to all 11th graders beginning this school year. The increase will also cover the cost of ACT Aspire, an assessment that will be given to students in grades 3-8. The committee agreed that any balance of EIA recurring and non-recurring funds should be allocated to fund instructional materials, both print and digital.
- Additionally, the EOC recommended an increase of $2.0 million for modernization of vocational equipment, a recommendation which came forward from the SC Department of Education.

Early Childhood Support
- Funding additional students in full-day 4K programs as well as appropriate $500,000 to Reach Out and Read Carolinas.
- The committee found that an increase of $4.0 million will be necessary to fund additional districts for the full-day, 4K program for students at risk for school failure in districts that now have a poverty index of 70% or higher.

Educator Support
- Increase funding for teacher supplies.
- Recognizing that many teachers use personal funds to provide supplies for their classrooms and students, the committee recommended an increase of $1.3 million to increase the teacher supply allocation to $300 per eligible teacher, an increase from the current $250 allocation.

Opportunity for Success Through Innovation

In January 2015, school districts received an invitation to apply for the SC Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program, a matching grants program designed to encourage sustainable partnerships among South Carolina school districts and community groups. Proviso 1.94 of the 2014-15 General Appropriation Act created the program, which is focused on “state-of-the-art education initiatives and models to improve students learning.”

“When there is community support of school initiatives, you often see a positive impact on student motivation and learning,” said Dr. Allison Jacques, Assistant Dean for Assessment at the University of South Carolina School of Education and chair of the seven-member grants committee. “We hope to be able to share many innovative ideas following the grant awards, particularly in high-poverty communities where it can be difficult to find community support.”

Grant applications, which must include matching financial support, cannot exceed $250,000 unless the grants committee finds that exceptional circumstances warrant exceeding that amount. It is expected that funded grants will be announced in late March 2015.
2013 Parent Survey

Since 2002 the SCDE has administered the parent survey to a sample of parents whose children attended public schools in South Carolina. From its inception, the parent survey contains items regarding parent perceptions of the learning environment in the school, home-school relations, and the social and physical environment of the school. Additional questions document characteristics of the parents and the children of the parents responding to the survey. Five new items are present in the 2013 Parent Survey, created by the State Department of Education. Two of these items collect information about the effectiveness of a child’s teacher and a child’s principal. One item addresses parent perceptions of the personalized learning experience of their child. Two items obtain information regarding whether parents have read the state and federal report cards for the school and district their child attends.

Annually, the EOC has analyzed the results of the parent survey and issued reports.

2013 Survey Responses: In 2013 the number of parent surveys completed and returned totaled 66,787, a decline of 2,793 surveys or 4.0 percent from the prior year.

An analysis of the respondents to the 2013 parent survey concluded that the survey responses typically overrepresented the perceptions of parents who had children in elementary schools and underrepresented the perceptions of parents who had children in high school. Furthermore, the respondents typically obtained higher educational achievements and had greater median household incomes than the general population of South Carolina. As in prior years, the “typical” parent responding to the survey was a white female having attended or graduated from college and having a household income of greater than $35,000. Furthermore, when compared to the enrollment of students in public schools, parents of African American students were underrepresented in the responses.

The data documented that the parent survey responses were generally representative, within four percentage points, of the percentage of students enrolled in schools by their Absolute Rating. Nine percent of the parents who responded to the survey had children attending schools with an Absolute Rating of Below Average or At Risk, the same percentage as students enrolled in a school with an Absolute Rating of Below Average or At Risk in school year 2012-13. On the other hand, 61 percent of the parents who responded to the survey had children attending schools with an Absolute Rating of Good or Excellent, compared to 60 percent of children who were enrolled in a school with an Absolute Rating of Good or Excellent in school year 2012-13.

Despite a 4.0 percent decline in the number of parents responding to the annual parent survey, the results of the 2013 parent survey demonstrate that parent satisfaction levels with the three characteristics measured - the learning environment, home and school relations and social and physical environment of their child’s school—were consistent with the prior year’s results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and School Relations</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Physical Environment</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards Review

Pursuant to Act 200 of 2014, passed by the SC General Assembly, the EOC is to consult with the State Board of Education and conduct a cyclical review of the current standards. According to state law, the review must begin on or before January 1, 2015, and the new college and career readiness state content standards must be implemented for the 2015-2016 school year. The following timeline outlines the EOC's involvement in the process:

South Carolina Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 2014</td>
<td>Notified Governor and General Assembly of initiation of cyclical review per Act 200. Asked for nominations of individuals to serve on panels to review current standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 2014</td>
<td>Launched website for Academic Standards Review Survey (link sent to district superintendents, PIOs, media outlets, ETV, higher education and business contacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Solicited recommendations for EOC Academic Standards Review Panels from district superintendents, instructional leaders, business/community leaders, higher education contacts, EOC members, State Board members, and TransformSC leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Selected and notified Academic Standards Review Panel members for EOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
<td>Academic Standards Review Survey website closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2014</td>
<td>ELA and Math Academic Standards Review Panels reviewed draft standards submitted by SCDE Writing Panels evaluating them for comprehensiveness, rigor, and organization/communication. Resources used during evaluation included current state standards, results of statewide survey of current standards, quality standards from other states, as well as other resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2014</td>
<td>EOC Evaluation Teams presented standards review and survey results to EOC Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2014</td>
<td>EOC Evaluation Teams presented standards review to full EOC; report and recommendations transmitted to SCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 24, 2014</td>
<td>EOC Evaluation Teams presented standards review to full EOC; report and recommendations transmitted to SCDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2015</td>
<td>Representatives from ELA EOC Evaluation Panel and SCDE ELA Writing Team met to revise draft of ELA standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2015</td>
<td>Representatives from Math Evaluation Panel and SCDE Math Writing Team met to revise draft of Math standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2015</td>
<td>State Board of Education gave first reading approval to new ELA standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2015</td>
<td>CHE Advisory Committee on Academic Programs to receive standards from SCDE. Group to determine college- and career-readiness of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2015</td>
<td>ASA and full EOC to meet to consider approval of new ELA and Math standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015 TBD</td>
<td>Anticipated State Board of Education second reading consideration of new standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2015</td>
<td>Anticipated State Board of Education second reading consideration of new standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Profile of the SC Graduate

**Building Post-secondary Success**

## COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS DATA

As part of its release of SC’s progress toward reaching the 2020 Vision, the EOC compiles and publishes data related to the SAT, ACT, and Advanced Placement participation and passage.

### SAT, 2009-2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Composite Score Reading &amp; Math</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among States</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>46th</td>
<td>46th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACT, 2009-2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Composite Score</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among States</td>
<td>46th</td>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>39th</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*maximum score in SAT Reading and Math: 1600; ACT maximum score: 36

The composite score on ACT is the average of the performance on four ACT Subject tests: English, Reading, Math, and Science.

### Advanced Placement (AP) Participation, 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Students who took an AP Exam in High School</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among states *</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rank is determined in a comparison of AP participation rates among all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

### Advanced Placement (AP) Passage, 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Students in graduating class scoring a 3 or higher on AP exam</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank among states*</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rank is determined in a comparison of AP passage rates among all 50 states and the District of Columbia.
Communicating important information isn’t innovative. However, in the Summer of 2014, the EOC, along with TransformSC leadership, recognized the urgent need to get information out to students and families about upcoming changes in assessment. With the assistance of education partners and ACT, information publications were produced by the EOC about WorkKeys and The ACT, assessments every 11th grader will take beginning in 2015. The information flyers were used by districts to communicate information to students and parents about why these tests were important to student success now and in the future.

Opportunity for Success Through Innovation

Changes in 11th Grade State Testing

Information for Students and Parents
This school year marks the beginning of important changes in state testing for all 11th graders in South Carolina. For the first time, the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) will include WorkKeys, first initiated in 11th grade with two assessments: the ACT, a college and career readiness assessment, and WorkKeys, which measures essential workforce skills.

What are the benefits of taking a workforce skills assessment like WorkKeys?

• Successful completion of WorkKeys® earns an 11th grader a National Career Readiness Certificate, enhancing his or her hiring prospects and providing job leads as well as internships in South Carolina. Over 1,500 employers recognize the Certificate.
• National companies and state-related workKeys® certificate issuing. South Carolina will document the skill levels of our state’s workforce and in turn, recruit more jobs that will be available to all students, including those graduating from schools to serve a larger labor force.
• A financial or personal crisis can occur and delay college plans. Having a WorkKeys® certificate can immediately open doors for jobs.

But, my child has never taken career and technical education courses.

Will he or she be prepared for WorkKeys®?

The WorkKeys® assessment measures “real world” skills that employers believe are critical to job success. Test questions are based on situations in the everyday work world. There are three parts of each assessment:

1. Applied Mathematics—Applying mathematics to real-world problems and problem solving to make informed decisions.
2. Reading for Information—Reading and using written texts like letters, directions, signs, menus, graphs, and tables to find information.
3. Locating Information—Using graphics like charts, graphs, and tables to find information.

11th graders should be prepared for the test no matter what courses they take in high school. Students who need assistance should take the opportunity to enroll in Career Ready 111, a preparatory course, this fall.

What does a WorkKeys® score mean?

Once each of the three assessments (Applied Mathematics, Reading for Information and Locating Information), an applicant receives a score of 1 (lowest) through 7 (highest), with 7 being the highest possible score. Depending upon the minimum score required on these assessments, the student may receive one of four National Career Readiness Certificates:

- Bronze: 27%
- Silver: 42%
- Gold: 76%
- Platinum: 100%

Scores for WorkKeys are available online at www.workkeys.com.

The ACT
Changes in 11th Grade Testing: Information for Students and Families

This school year marks the beginning of important changes in state testing for all 11th graders in South Carolina. The High School Assessment Program (HSAP) will include WorkKeys, which measures essential workforce skills.

What is the ACT?
The ACT test is a college readiness measure that assesses English, reading, math, science, and writing. It measures what students have learned in high school coursework. The ACT includes 24 multiple-choice questions and takes approximately 4 hours to complete, including a short break. Actual testing time is 3 hours and 25 minutes. The testing portion of the test, which is included in the retaking time, is 3 hours.

Who will take the ACT in 2015? and what will it be administered?
Students who entered ninth grade in school year 2013-14 will take the ACT in May. The English, Math, Reading, and Science tests will be administered on Tuesday, April 28, 2015.

Why is every 11th grader taking the test this year?
The S.C. General Assembly included legislation in 2014 requiring that all 11th grade students take WorkKeys® as well as an assessment that measures college readiness. The ACT was chosen as a result of a district commitment. These assessments measure how well-prepared students are for coursework in science and four year college as well as the jobs available in today’s workforce. If your child has documented barriers requiring modified accommodations, you should discuss these with your child’s school about testing options.

One of the benefits of the legislation is that the state now covers the cost of the administration of the ACT assessment in 11th grade, a current savings of $765k.

What are the benefits of taking the ACT and should students not planning on going to college take the ACT?
There are many benefits including:
• The ACT is accepted by all four year colleges and universities in the United States as well as all of South Carolina’s two year colleges.
• By taking the ACT students make themselves visible to colleges and scholarship agencies. Scores can also be used to qualify for SAT, Blanket Aid, and other scholarships.
• Students can see where they stand with the ACT if they choose to do so.

And, a student needs to do his or her best on the ACT because the results may provide some choices for the future. A student may discover that they do not have the skills and knowledge to pursue a certain profession or four year degree. Just knowing the information will help plan for the future. Once a person starts working, they may decide that they want or need a four year degree. It may help a student better understand choices they may make. Even if a score does not immediately enter college upon graduation, their ACT score is valid for up to five years.
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