

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

Minutes

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2006

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

RUTLEDGE STATE OFFICE BUILDING

BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

Joe Isaac, Chair

John Tindal, Chair-Elect

Inez M. Tenenbaum

State Superintendent of Education

Secretary and Administrative Officer to the Board

I. WELCOME/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Isaac brought the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

The following State Board of Education members were in attendance: Joe Isaac, Chair; John Tindal, Chair Elect; Ms. Rebecca Burch; Mr. Jessie R. Curtis; Mr. Trip DuBard; Mr. Mike Forrester; Mrs. Kristin Maguire; Mr. Charles McKinney; Mr. Ben Mitchell; Mrs. Patsy Pye; Mrs. Terrye Seckinger; Dr. Danny Varat; Ms. Diane Sumpter; Mrs. Virginia Wilson, and Dr. Kristi Woodall. Mr. Al Simpson and Mr. Ron Wilson were excused for their absence. Carol Collins, Administrative Assistant; Shelly Bezanson Kelly, Parliamentarian; and staff of the State Department of Education were also present. State Superintendent Inez Tenenbaum was unable to attend.

II. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2006, MEETING

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved for approval of the minutes of the September 13, 2006, meeting. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

III. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 11, 2006

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved for approval of the State Board of Education agenda for October 11, 2006. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

IV. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS, INCLUDING NEWS MEDIA

Chair Isaac welcomed all visitors and asked them to stand and be recognized. He then recognized Ms. Beth Pinson and Dr. Anne Crook former State Board of Education members.

V. STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION REPORT

Ms. Cindy Saylor, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, represented Mrs. Tenenbaum. She recognized Mr. Alex Romanczuk and presented him with an award for obtaining 2,400 on the SAT. Alex is a student in Charleston County and attends the Academic Magnet High School. He wasn't satisfied with his score of 2,300 on the SAT, so he decided to retake the SAT. The second time around, he scored a perfect 2,400, a rarity in the state and nation.

Dr. Janice Poda, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership, represented Mrs. Tenenbaum. She recognized Ms. Julie Macker for being named No Child Left Behind 2006 American Star of Teaching and presented her with an award. Ms. Macker teaches at Brennan Elementary School in Richland One School District. She is a National Deaf Education Master Teacher and a National Deaf Education Cyber Mentor. She is working toward National Board certification and a doctorate degree.

Dr. Cleo Richardson, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership represented Mrs. Tenenbaum, in recognizing the 2006 South Carolina's State Board volunteer award winners.

Silver Award Winners

East Lake Community Church Acts
Lexington School District Five

Accepted by: Mr. Chris Manley
State Board member: Mr. Jessie Curtis

Children's School PTA Board
Rock Hill School District Three

Accepted by: Mr. Dominic Di Francesco
State Board member: Dr. Kristi Woodall

Rock Hill School District Foundation
Rock Hill School District Three

Accepted by: Ms. Serena Williams
State Board member: Dr. Kristi Woodall

Ms. Marietta Hicks and Roscoe (Therapy Dog)
Berkeley County

State Board member: Mrs. Terrye Seckinger

Dr. Martha Edwards
Rock Hill School District Three

State Board member: Dr. Kristi Woodall

Ms. Mayor Elaine Harris
Spartanburg School District Three

State Board member: Mr. Mike Forrester

Ms. Annette Farrell

Lexington School District Five

State Board member: Mr. Jessie Curtis

International Paper Company

Richland School District One

Accepted by: Ms. Susan McPherson

State Board member: Ms. Diane Sumpter

Upchurch & Jowers Insurance Agency, Inc.

Kershaw County School District

Accepted by: Mr. Joe Upchurch & Mr. Victor Jowers

State Board member: Ms. Diane Sumpter

Gold Awards Winners

James Ervin Toyota

Kershaw County School District

Accepted by: Mr. James Ervin

State Board member: Ms. Diane Sumpter

Mr. James L. Harris

Marion School District Seven

State Board member: Mr. Fred "Trip" DuBard

Gilbert Town Council

Lexington School District One

Accepted by: Mayor Pro Tem Tom Harmon

State Board member: Mr. Jessie Curtis

Wade Hampton High School

Improvement Council
Greenville County School District

Accepted by: Ms. Ginger Stuart

State Board member: Dr. Danny Varat

Bookman Road Elementary

School Improvement
Richland School District One

Accepted by: Mr. Michael Guiliano

State Board member: Ms. Diane Sumpter

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Isaac recognized William Halligan, Esquire. Mr. Halligan was recognized to make a motion requesting that Public Comment not be taken during the Public Comment period with regard to the Thornwell Charter School Hearing. Mr. Halligan's request was denied by Chair Isaac.

Chair Isaac recognized the following nine people for public comment.

The following six people spoke with regard to Thornwell Charter School's Appeal of a denial of a Charter by the Laurens County School District 56 Board of Trustees:

1. The Honorable Jeff Duncan, South Carolina House of Representatives
2. The Honorable Danny Verdin, Senate of South Carolina
3. Mr. Adam Hucks, Parent
4. Ms. Wanda Isaac, Former Educator, Laurens School District 56
5. Brenda Romines, Principal, Clinton Elementary School, Laurens School District 56
6. John Taylor, Former Interim Superintendent, Laurens School District 56

The following three people spoke on the South Carolina Uniform Grading Policy.

1. Ms. Beth Pinson, Former member State Board of Education
2. Mr. Wayne Brazell, Instructional Leaders Roundtable
3. Anne Crook, PhD, Former member State Board of Education and President, Orangeburg/Calhoun Technical College

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

Promulgate Repeal of 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-262.3 (Supp. 2005), Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Objectives for Grades 9–12, Document No. 3072 (Second Reading)

Liz Jones, Coordinator, Test Administration Unit, Office of Assessment, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item on behalf of Dr. Teri Siskind. Ms. Jones stated that this item is for the promulgation of the repeal of 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-262.3 (Supp. 2005), Reading, Writing and Mathematics Objectives for Grades 9–12. She said that this regulation is no longer needed because the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) has replaced the Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP) exit examination.

Ms. Jones stated that no comments were received from the public on the repeal of this regulation.

There were no public speakers for this item.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education approve the promulgation of the repeal of 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-262.3 (Supp. 2005), Reading, Writing and Mathematics Objectives for Grades 9–12 (Second Reading). Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

VIII. STATE BOARD ITEMS

56. Teacher Recruitment, Training, and Certification Items Kristin Maguire, Facilitator

FOR APPROVAL

01. TRTC Items Overview

Janice Poda, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership, gave a brief overview of the TRTC items. Dr. Poda also announced to the Board that this was her last day with the Department and her last Board meeting. She expressed a special thank you to the Board for volunteering their time to ensure that all children have a great education. She stated that she would be going to work with Winthrop University.

Chair Isaac thanked Dr. Poda for the outstanding job she has done over the years.

02. Comparable Scores on the ACT and SAT for Teacher Education Candidates to Meet the Basic Skills Exam Requirement for Admission into a Teacher Education Program (Second Reading)

Allison Jacques, PhD, Director, Office of Educator Preparation, Support, and Assessment, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership, presented this item for second reading. She explained that the General Assembly approved changes to Proviso 1.30 that states, "any person having attained 1100 or better on the SAT or a comparable ACT score shall be exempt from this requirement [to take the basic skills exam]." In 2005, the College Board added a writing test to the SAT that makes it possible for a student to make a perfect score of 2400, rather than 1600.

Dr. Jacques stated that the Division of Educator Quality and Leadership recommended State Board of Education approval of the comparable scores for exempting the basic skills examination required for admission into a teacher education program.

Mrs. Terrye Seckinger moved to accept the comparable scores on the ACT and SAT for teacher education candidates to meet the basic skills examination requirement for admission into a teacher education program. Mr. John Tindal seconded the motion. The motion carried.

03. Committee Members to Establish a Common Definition of Program Completers for South Carolina Educator Preparation Units

Allison Jacques, PhD, Director, Office of Educator Preparation, Support, and Assessment, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership, presented this item.

Dr. Jacques stated that it was necessary for the State Board to establish a list of members for a committee to establish a common definition of program completers for South Carolina educator preparation units. She stated each educator preparation unit in South Carolina currently establishes its own definition of a program completer. The inconsistency of program completer definitions across the state creates disparities in reporting percentages of program completers for the Higher Education Act Title II report. A common definition of program completer in South Carolina is necessary in order to ensure consistency in Title II reporting.

She said that the Division of Educator Quality and Leadership recommends approval of the proposed members for a committee to establish a common definition of program completers for South Carolina educator preparation units.

Mr. Trip DuBard moved to accept the recommendation to approve the list of members for a committee to establish a common definition of program completers for South Carolina educator preparation units. Mr. Charles McKinney seconded the motion. The motion carried.

04. The Professional Review Committee's (PRC) Recommendation, With Conditions, for the Early Childhood Preparation Program at Newberry College

Allison Jacques, PhD, Director, Office of Educator Preparation, Support, and Assessment, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership, presented this item. She stated that this item was to approve the Professional Review Committee's (PRC) recommendation, with conditions, for the Early Childhood Preparation Program at Newberry College.

Dr. Jacques explained that in South Carolina, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, national accrediting agency standards or state approval standards are used to hold all educator preparation programs accountable. A three-member team, trained on the program review process, read, discussed, and reached consensus on whether the program was "approved," "approved with conditions," or "not approved." If the institution does not submit data on their candidates and program, the program may be considered "approved with conditions."

The Division of Educator Quality and Leadership recommended that the State Board of Education approve the PRC's recommendation to approve, with conditions, the Early Childhood preparation program at Newberry College.

Mr. Charles McKinney moved to accept the recommendation to approve the PRC's recommendation to approve, with Conditions, the Early Childhood Preparation Program at Newberry College. Mrs. Terrye Seckinger seconded the motion. The motion carried.

05. The Professional Review Committee's (PRC) Recommendation to Grant South Carolina State University's Extensions in Art and Theatre Education Programs

Allison Jacques, PhD, Director, Office of Educator Preparation, Support, and Assessment, Division of Educator Quality and Leadership presented this item. Dr. Jacques explained that this item was being submitted for the State Board to approve the PRC's recommendation to grant South Carolina State University's request for an extension for their Art and Theatre Education programs.

Dr. Jacques stated that South Carolina State University requested extensions in their program review process for initial programs in Art and Theatre Education. A discussion with representatives from the institution was conducted during the PRC meeting in September 2006. After discussions with the institutional representatives, the PRC recommended that the Art and Theatre Education preparation programs be granted an extension. The PRC recommends that the Art and Theatre Education preparation programs be granted an extension based on providing

documentation that on-site accreditation visits by the respective accrediting organizations will be scheduled as soon as possible and all issues associated with accreditation approval will be resolved no more than one year from the date of the scheduled accreditation visits. Failure to meet the documentation and timelines associated with the programs will result in termination of the programs. The PRC's recommendation is being brought to the State Board for final approval.

The Division of Educator Quality and Leadership recommends that the State Board of Education approve the PRC's recommendation to grant an extension of obtaining program approval for South Carolina State University's preparation programs in Art and Theatre Education.

Dr. Kristi Woodall moved to accept the recommendation that the State Board approve the PRC's recommendation to grant an extension of obtaining program approval for South Carolina State University's preparation programs in Art and Theatre Education. Mr. Ben Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mrs. Maguire expressed her appreciation to Dr. Poda in working with the Board.

55. Curriculum and Instructional Materials Items
Kristi Woodall, EdD, Facilitator

FOR APPROVAL

01. C&I Items Overview

Lucinda Saylor, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented a brief overview of the items.

02. Proposed Amendments to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-205 (Supp. 2005), Administrative and Professional Personnel Qualifications, Duties and Workloads (First Reading)

Janet Perry, Education Associate, Office of School Quality, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item for first reading. She stated that Regulation 43-205, Administrative and Professional Personnel Qualifications, Duties and Workloads, was being amended to include provisions of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005, S.C. Code Ann. § 59-59-10 *et seq.* (Supp. 2005).

She stated that as a result of the Education Economic and Development Act (EEDA), the position and qualifications for a career specialist were added to the section for grades six through eight. The qualifications for the career specialist were also aligned with the EEDA in grades six through twelve (the position now requires specialized training and certification).

The student-to-guidance services ratio reduction mandated by the EEDA is supported by proposed amendments to this regulation. When the ratios specified in the EEDA are achieved in 2012 through the EEDA funding, the personnel workloads for guidance services can be amended.

The student-teacher ratios for cross-categorical self-contained special education classes (i.e., the comingling of students with disabilities) were added to this regulation. Previously, student-teacher ratios for comingled classes were required to be specified in an innovative-approach application that was approved by the State Department Education.

Ms. Perry stated that the State Department of Education recommended that the State Board of Education approve the amendments to Regulation 43-205 for first reading.

Mr. Charles McKinney moved to accept the State Department of Education's recommendation to approve State Board of Education Regulation 43-205, Administrative and Professional Personnel Qualifications, Duties and Workloads for first reading. Ms. Virginia Wilson seconded the motion.

Dr. Kristi Woodall asked Ms. Perry to address career specialist and the issue of the EEDA not being fully implemented yet. Ms. Perry stated that the qualifications for career specialist are what is addressed in the regulation. In grades six through eight when EEDA added the career specialist and the guidelines were approved, then the next step was to add them to regulations. Ms. Saylor asked if Dr. Woodall was talking about the section dealing with ratio. Ms. Saylor stated that what was being addressed in the regulation was what in the EEDA but not hold schools accountable until the funding is there to meet that ratio.

Mrs. Maguire asked whether or not Section III(B)(4)(c) dealing with the maximum teaching load was in the best interest of the children because the ratios seem high. Ms. Perry referred this question to Mrs. Susan Durant, Director of the Office of Exceptional Children. Mrs. Durant stated that maximums for these classrooms are high. What was done in this regulation was to formalize the practice of comingling students with different disabilities. These ratios are not different from what our maximums currently are for classes with students with disabilities. Teachers would say the ratios need to be lower. Mrs. Durant said that the reality is that with the shortage of special education teachers we have and with the shortages of classroom space, tremendous problems would be

created if today we lowered those ratios. What this does allow is more appropriate grouping for instruction for children with mild disabilities.

Mrs. Maguire then asked if this pushes the envelope toward this maximum since it is set at that ratio. Mrs. Durant responded that she believes this will reduce the paperwork requirements for allowing some additional flexibility that would assist with more appropriate instruction. She states that this will reduce the number of students in self-contained classes.

Mr. DuBard asked if in high school special education teachers have to be highly qualified. Mrs. Durant stated that in all cases they have to be highly qualified if they are providing core instruction. The exception would be those teachers who teach the most significantly cognitive impaired students. Those are our students who are moderately and significantly mentally impaired. In that case, they must be highly qualified at the elementary level. Mr. DuBard asked if elementary certified teachers are teaching the mentally challenged students in the high schools. Ms. Durant stated that this is the case for moderately to severe. The big challenge has been requiring "highly qualified" for special education is that our special education teachers have been attempting to teach subjects in which they are not highly qualified. They don't have the core content, so our students have not been opposed to the content that they deserve. Therefore, they are not performing at the levels they can.

There being no further questions, Dr. Woodall called for the vote. The motion carried.

03. **Proposed Amendments to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-234 (Supp. 2005), Defined Program, Grades 9–12 (First Reading)**

Lucinda Saylor, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this regulation. She stated that this regulation was being amended to include provisions of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005, S.C. Code Ann. § 59-59-10 *et seq.* (Supp. 2005), and the recommendations of the High School Redesign Commission (HSRC).

The State Superintendent of Education charged an agency cross-divisional committee to review and recommend modifications to SBE Regulation 43-234 consistent with the EEDA and the recommendations of the HSRC. The cross-divisional committee recommended a reorganization of the regulation to achieve this goal. One such recommendation was to move all requirements for earning a state high school diploma into this regulation.

A draft of the regulation was presented in five regional input sessions in August and September. The regulation presented to the State Board of Education contains the district representatives' input.

The EEDA and the recommendations of the HSRC set a new direction for high schools through these proposed amendments by requiring district boards of trustees to approve career majors and individualized education choices. The regulation also

- allows schools to award credit for courses approved by the State Department of Education in a proficiency-based system,
- allows credit for a three-hour postsecondary course to transfer as one unit of high school credit under a district's dual credit arrangement,
- embraces the career clusters for the first time as part of the curriculum for grades nine through twelve,
- includes financial literacy in the instructional program for the first time,
- stipulates that the required comprehensive guidance program must be composed of grade-specific standards and lead to a seamless transition to relevant employment or postsecondary study,
- updates the data collection requirements,
- removes two courses that do not meet the EEDA intensity for rigor, and
- specifies the deadline 2010 for passing a science course with an end-of-course assessment as a graduation requirement.

Mrs. Saylor reviewed the regulation with members of the Board. She discussed Section I(C) of the regulation regarding physical science or whatever that science requirement might be for high school graduation. The exact wording in Act 254, the new assessment bill that states students must pass a high school credit course in science in which an end-of-course test is administered, was used so that we could continue to have discussions and gather input on what could be done regarding physical science or biology. She said that they have talked with the United States Department of Education and have an open survey in which we have received over six hundred responses. In November, this item will be brought back as an information item to provide the Board with the status of the survey.

Mrs. Maguire asked if it was possible for students to take other courses and sit for the physical science exam and show proficiency without taking the course. Ms. Saylor stated that if physical science was one of the courses that is developed in the proficiency basis system, the answer is yes. Mrs. Maguire stated that if you take physics, chemistry, and biology you should be able to take a physical science exam. Ms. Saylor stated that Act 254, says that the student has to earn a unit in one of these courses. Lists of courses or requirements have not been developed at this time. Mrs. Maguire stated that she saw a conflict.

Mr. McKinney asked if students are taking physical science and then taking chemistry and physics by the tenth grade, where is the math coming in to allow the child to be successful in physics. He stated that a child needed to be enrolled in algebra or trigonometry at least. He expressed concern on how students would get their math load by the tenth grade. Ms. Saylor stated that the provision was put in the regulation for accelerated students, particularly IB students.

Mrs. Saylor explained Section IID. She stated that for those courses that have end-of-course tests, English I, Algebra I, Physical Science, U.S. History, Biology, students would have to take these courses in a school-approved situation.

Mr. Mike Forrester asked if a student could take an on-line course. Ms. Saylor stated yes, if it was a school-approved situation. The school should approve these courses ahead of time.

Mrs. Maguire asked why it stated in Section IV credits "may" be accepted instead of "shall" be accepted. Ms. Saylor stated that regulation 43-273 addresses this.

Mrs. Seckinger asked why it would not be the same language as that regulation. Ms. Saylor stated that this was just an introduction to show where to go to information on transfers. The word "may" is used all the way through the regulation.

Dr. Woodall stated the reason might be that they might not match. You would have to go to the reference of the specific regulation because South Carolina may not offer comparable courses where they can find the match to credit it. Ms. Saylor said that if you look at the regulations there are a couple ways to approve credit. It says that the "shall" happens when the child transfers in with a credit from a school that has been accredited by any of the six accrediting agencies. If it is not accredited by one of the six accredited agencies, schools can give that child a test. It gives schools options, especially if a child is not coming from an accredited school.

Mrs. Maguire stated that it says "who enrolls in a public school after having been enrolled in another school in this state." Ms. Saylor stated that it also said "or in a school in another state." The regulations tells you when you "shall" and when you "may."

Mrs. Seckinger stated that she felt "shall" was appropriate in this case. Ms. Saylor stated that she disagreed because if you use "shall" it means any course taken anytime, anywhere, can be transferred without regard to the quality of the course.

Mrs. Maguire stated that there were a lot of regulations referenced and it would be helpful if the members had the links. Ms. Saylor stated that she would provide them with this information.

Mrs. Seckinger asked why the language the state had just passed "credit for religious studies" was not in the regulation. Dr. Woodall stated it was listed under electives. Mrs. Seckinger felt that since Keyboarding, American Sign Language, and Dual Credit, were listed would it not be appropriate to put this under Item II, Provisions for Schools in the Awarding for High School Credits. Ms. Saylor stated this was a good point and she would look into it.

Mrs. Saylor stated that in Section V under English Language Arts, Communication for the Workplace 3 and 4 were being phased out.

Mrs. Maguire asked if the state was able to recruit teachers who teach Discrete Mathematics. Ms. Saylor stated that she did not know. She said that this was an optional course.

Ms. Seckinger asked if we were working on a management information system that would track a student when they leave and enter back into public schools. Ms. Saylor stated that the student unique identifier number (SUNS) would be the way to track this information. Mrs. Seckinger asked if we were close to going online. Ms. Saylor asked Mrs. Betsy Carpentier to respond to this question. Ms. Carpentier stated that we are 98 percent ready.

Dr. Woodall asked if we tracked students who drop out of high school and then get a GED or diploma years later through adult education. Mrs. Carpentier responded that we did, but the AYP calculations are not part of the report cards. It does end up on the census report.

Mr. DuBard stated that Dr. Woodall's question was does the data track the individual or do you just have the number of GED's and number of people who dropped out of school. Ms. Carpentier stated that we haven't been able to track that information by student but with the SUNS numbers, we would be able to track that type of information.

Ms. Saylor stated that the State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve the amendments to State Board of Education Regulation 43-234 for first reading.

Mr. Charles McKinney moved to accept the State Department of Education's recommendation that the State Board of Education approve the amendments to Regulation 43-234 for first reading. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mrs. Maguire asked who received the survey regarding biology and physical science. Ms. Saylor stated that it was sent to the Superintendents, High School Principals, Assistant Superintendents, State Board of Education members, Career and Technology Education as a database, the Chamber of Commerce, and other business leaders, Guidance Counselors, and also the Commission on Higher Education.

FOR INFORMATION

04. English Language Arts Academic Standards 2007 Field Review Draft

Cathy R. Jones, Education Associate, Office of Curriculum and Standards, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item for information. She stated that the purpose of this item was to update the State Board of Education on the revision and field review process for the English language arts academic standards.

The *South Carolina English Language Arts Curriculum Standards 2002* have been reviewed by committees of educators including special educators, media specialists and teachers of English language learners from across the state as well as parents, community members, and national experts, as outlined by the State Department of Education and Education Oversight Committee (EOC) Standard Operating Procedure. All groups made recommendations for revision. The state writing panel met to implement recommendations for revision from the various panels and the MidContinental Regional Education Laboratory (McREL) into the field review draft of the 2007 English language arts academic standards. The field review period will occur from September 7 until October 29, 2006, with input from the review used as a basis for making final revisions to the document before it is presented to the State Board of Education in December for first reading approval.

Mrs. Seckinger, Mrs. Maguire, Ms. Sumpter, and Mr. Isaac expressed their belief that children should be encouraged to read as much as possible.

Ms. Wilson stated that her school was one of the Reading First schools. She questioned if Reading First schools would be expanded across the state or would it still be just a limited number of schools across the state. Ms. Saylor stated that it would always be a small number because there are still federal guidelines in terms of qualifications to be a Reading First school. A lot of schools will not have the opportunity to participate.

54. Finance and Legislative Items
Terrye Seckinger, Facilitator

FOR APPROVAL

01. F&L Items Overview

Betsy Carpentier, Deputy Superintendent, Division of School Enterprise Operations, presented this overview for Mr. John Cooley.

02. Facilities Waiver—Lancaster County School District

Alex C. James, Director, Office of School Facilities, Division of School Enterprise Operations, presented this item. Mr. James stated that Lancaster County School District had requested a facility Waiver Request. He stated that Goforth, Brown, & Associates made a formal request for a waiver on the single-hung windows at Buford and South Middle Schools in the Lancaster County School District. These windows are smaller than our state regulatory requirement of 6 square feet of opening on an egress window. The exact clear opening dimension is 5.6 square feet at Buford Middle with a possibility of expanding that area to 5.75 square feet, and 5.3 square feet at South Middle with no possibility of increasing the opening. The building code requires 5 square feet for egress windows.

Ms. Sumpter asked why the contractor was not taking responsibility for the windows being hung smaller than the state regulatory requirement of 6 square feet. Mr. James stated that if the contractor did that what would be the process for occupying the space on time. He said that in the past we have allowed them the time to make the correction but he didn't recommend that make the correction since it fulfills building code. It is a one-story building; if it were a two-story building, he would have a problem with it, and it would not be used for elementary students. He felt that it was a valid issue for the South Carolina School Facilities Committee to look at and change the regulatory requirements.

Mr. Tindal stated his concern was that you didn't want the architects to keep making mistakes and the Board having to come in and grant exceptions. Mr. James stated that the contractor had erred on the shop drawings.

The Office of School Facilities recommended a one-time approval of this waiver since the windows meet building code requirements, and they are not in an elementary school. The Lancaster County School District supports this waiver request. The waiver should clearly state that Buford Middle School and South Middle School couldn't ever be used as elementary schools.

Mr. John Tindal moved to accept the Office of School Facilities recommendation for a one-time approval of this waiver since the windows meet building code requirements, and they are not in an elementary school and that the waiver should clearly state that Buford Middle School and South Middle School couldn't ever be used as elementary schools. Dr. Kristin Woodall seconded the motion. The motion carried.

03. Facilities Waiver Request for Property Disposal—Lancaster County School District

Alex C. James, Director, Office of School Facilities, Division of School Enterprise Operations, presented this request for property disposal from Lancaster County School District.

Mr. James stated that the Lancaster School Board of Trustees is requesting the approval of the sale of .7711 acres, which is a part of the current site (approximately 140 acres), occupied by Indian Land High School and Indian Land Elementary/Middle School. This parcel of land was purchased in the early 1970s, and the district has no records available to determine if state funding was used in the purchase. The district asks for approval to sell this parcel to the Lancaster County Water and Sewer for the purposes of adding a water tower and expanding on a water pumping station. Current construction on the property includes the conversion of the existing high school into a middle school and the construction of a new high school. The sale of the property will not have a discernible negative impact upon any other district school facility or site, and proceeds from the sale of the property defined in the attached contract shall go to the district's capital budget for subsequent use.

The Office of School Facilities recommends State Board approval.

Mr. John Tindal moved to accept the recommendation from the Office of School Facilities to approve the facilities waiver request for property disposal from Lancaster County School District. Ms. Rebecca Burch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

FOR INFORMATION

04. State Board of Education Financial Statements

Betsy Carpentier, Deputy Superintendent, Division of School Enterprise Operations, presented this item on behalf of Mr. Cooley and gave the Board a briefing on the their financial statement.

52. Educational Policy Items
Joe Isaac, Facilitator

FOR APPROVAL

01. Policy Items Overview

Dale Stuckey, Esquire, Chief Counsel, Office of General Counsel, gave an overview on the Policy items.

02. Proposed New Regulation to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-274.1, At-Risk Students (to be Codified at Supp. 2007) (First Reading)

Wofford O'Sullivan, Education Associate, Office of Career and Technology Education, Division of District and Community Services, presented this item. He explained that the purpose of this new regulation is to provide requirements and guidance to districts for implementing Section 59-59-150 of the South Carolina Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA), S.C. Code Ann. § 59-59-10, *et seq.* (Supp. 2005) relating specifically to At-Risk Students. The mandates of Section 59-59-150 of the EEDA must be fully implemented by the board of trustees of every school district in South Carolina by the school year 2007–08.

This regulation addresses the requirement of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005 that a separate regulation be written for at-risk students. The regulation defines at-risk students and outlines specific objective criteria for districts to use in the identification of students at-risk for being poorly prepared for the next level of study or for dropping out of school. The criteria includes diagnostic assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses in the core academic areas. The State Department of Education in collaboration with school districts will ensure that students are being properly identified and provided timely, appropriate guidance and assistance and to ensure that no group is disproportionately represented. The regulation refers to an implementation document to be provided by the State Department of Education that will include evidence-based model programs for at-risk students designed to ensure that students have an opportunity to graduate with a state high school diploma. The document will include an evaluation of model programs in place in each high school to ensure the programs are providing students an opportunity to graduate with a state high school diploma.

The State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve R 43-274.1, At-Risk Students, for first reading.

Dr. Woodall asked a question regarding Section IV(F), how will at-risk students be discussed on district and school report cards. Mr. O'Sullivan stated it would come in on reports developed in the implementation guide

as part of the assessment for the model implementation. Dr. Woodall then asked if there was to be a narrative on the report cards. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that it would be a narrative but it must include the narratives listed under Section V(A), Evaluation Criteria. Dr. Woodall asked if this would print out on everyone's report card. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that it would not; it would be on a separate report to the at-risk Alternative Schools Office here in the Department of Education. Dr. Woodall then asked what it meant "for use on district and school report card." What would that look like, if it was for a specific high school would it go into detail about what their numbers are? Mr. O'Sullivan stated that was a reference and also a reference for VI, Model, Initiative, and/or Program Evaluation and Assessment Reporting might be better to move it here as a citation. Those indicators in VI are taken directly from the Economic Education Development Act.

Dr. Woodall stated that she understood reporting the numbers, like the content of the disciplinary climate, promotion retention, etc. She was not clear on how you would talk about addressing the needs on that limited space. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that he understood her comment; it might be more appropriate to change the language to stop at the State Department's of Education report rather than "for use on district's report cards." Dr. Woodall said that she understood the need for statistics.

Mr. Mitchell asked about how you would identify the at-risk students. Mr. O'Sullivan stated it would depend upon the model selected. He stated that as of today, in working with the National Drop-Out Center and Communities in Schools, they identified forty-five models that will become part of the implementation guide from which schools may choose for implementation. He also stated that at this time school districts having the option of submitting other models and initiatives for review by the State Department of Education for implementation. There is a lot of flexibility. Students may be identified in middle grades, for transition models and programs; other students would be identified as ninth grade students in terms of the models that have been selected. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that the decision to drop out of school is made far sooner than the ninth graders, in many cases. The act takes place when they are old enough to walk out the door.

Ms. Sumpter asked what assurances and mechanisms would be put in place so that the things that are being done to help the student, doesn't end up harming them. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that they tried to include assurances to be certain that populations were not over identified in any of the models that were put in place. In Section IV, the regulation addresses subpopulations being identified and ensuring that the demographics of those subgroups be appropriate for the demographics as displayed in any particular school.

Mrs. Maguire asked about Section II(A), the indicators with academic performance. She questioned declining academic performance, with the social pressures a student has in his freshman and sophomore year, and whether that would be a factor. Mr. O'Sullivan said that looking at II(B), the indicators, predictors, and barriers, this is a very short list. The all-inclusive list from the National Institution will include just that type of language. Mrs. Maguire asked about previous incarceration, how would a child's privacy be protected. When you ID a student as being at-risk, a lot of this information is personnel. She questioned who determines whether the adult is caring or not. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that the privacy issue could be one of concern. For example, we have over one hundred of our high schools in the whole school reform models of high schools that work. The key practice addressing at-risk students is that the model is a system of extra help, no subpopulation is identified, so depending on the model privacy issues may or may not be a factor. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that the parental involvement feature that is built into the regulation would address that concern and help young people feel good about being a program. Students will not be forced to participate in programs.

Mrs. Seckinger asked if Judge Byers was involved in this regulation at all. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that he was not. Mrs. Seckinger stated that Judge Byers needed to be involved, since he is head of the Department of Juvenile Justice and former family court judge. Mrs. Seckinger stated that forty-five models were very overwhelming and she felt that this number could be paired down some. Mrs. Seckinger said that she felt we should back up the model to at least middle school and have some models that mirror an elementary school setting where you can not only deal with the child but you can help the family gather around that child, so the child will stay in school.

Mr. Forrester stated that he also felt that forty-five models were overwhelming. There has to be some best practices in this, so it can be narrowed down. He stated that he would like to see things standardized. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that he understood their concerns, but he felt that in this case we might need to err on the side of going a little bit overboard rather than not responding to districts' request for flexibility.

Mr. Tindal asked Mr. O'Sullivan to address the issue of funding in order to be able to do this. Mr. Tindal stated that he understood the addition of funding that would be received would simply be to add guidance counselors to the high schools. In order to do some of these things it is going to be very expensive. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that some of the models were very expensive, some had absolutely no expense, again with our flexibility we felt we needed to provide both. The guidance counselors for middle grades were funded and in place this year. For high schools it will be next year. There is a separate 4.5 million dollar request to implement additional model programs and pilot sites for at-risk students in the 2007-08 school year.

Mr. Tindal then asked if Jobs for South Carolina Graduates are acceptable models. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that it was, and he thought it was a Gold Standard Model. There will be two tiers presented in the models. The first is a tier of exemplary models, meaning they meet the Gold Standard, having two external reviews and research elements attached to them. The second tier includes promising models, which are models that have data to support them but have not gone through the external review and research component.

Mr. Mitchell asked if you would identify the students as special need population, would they have an IEP. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that those students could be included in these at-risk populations. They may or may not, just because they are a special needs student, that doesn't mean they are at-risk for dropping out of school.

Mr. DuBard stated he agreed with the too many programs ideas. One other reason to try and focus is to market those who are not educators. He stated that if you look outside the school district, there are a lot of people who want to address dropout and at-risk kids. Mr. O'Sullivan responded that some of the models identified are models involving civic organizations and support groups.

Mr. Mike Forrester moved to approve 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-274.1, At-Risk Students for first reading. Mrs. Kristin Maguire seconded the motion.

Dr. Woodall asked if the section about reporting on district report cards would be removed. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that they would take out the statement. It could be done without an amendment.

Mrs. Seckinger stated that this is a wonderful opportunity to collaborate with the Department of Juvenile Justice. Mr. O'Sullivan stated that he would contact Judge Byers and ask him to join the Committee.

Chair Isaac stated that if there were no more comments, he would call for the vote. The motion carried.

03. Proposed Amendments to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-600 (Supp. 2005), Charter School Appeals (First Reading)

Shelly Bezanson Kelly, Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, presented this regulation to the Board. Ms. Kelly stated that the law was amended in 2006 to create the South Carolina Public Charter School District. This district is authorized to sponsor charter schools. Regulation 43-600 needs to be amended to address the changes in the appellate procedure required because of the creation of this new district.

Ms. Kelly explained that the State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve the amendments to Regulation 43-600, Charter School Appeals.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved to approve amendments to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-600 (Supp. 2005), Charter School Appeals, with the change in language in Section IV(A) to read "A local school district board of trustees may file an appeal to the State Board of Education if it believes has information that an application approved by the Charter School District" for first reading. Mr. McKinney seconded the motion.

Mrs. Seckinger had a point of clarification. She questioned whether the Board would hear these cases as an appellant body. Ms. Kelly stated that the Board would not be an "appellant body" in the same sense as in other appeals where the Board is reviewing a decision of another board. However, the law says it is an "appeal" to the Board.

Mr. Isaac called for the vote. The motion carried.

04. South Carolina State Board of Education Model Policies Prohibiting Harassment, Intimidation, or Bullying at School (Second Reading)

Beth Mackinem, Education Associate, Office of Safe Schools and Youth Services, Division of District and Community Services, presented this item for second reading. Ms. Mackinem explained that the purpose of this report is to present to the State Board for approval model policies prohibiting harassment, intimidation, or bullying at school.

2006 S.C. Act 353 (to be codified at S.C. Code Ann. § 59-63-110, *et seq.*), The Safe School Climate Act, requires local school districts to adopt a policy prohibiting harassment, intimidation, or bullying at school. The Act requires the State Board of Education to develop model policies that will assist local school districts in the development of local policies for the prevention of harassment, intimidation, or bullying.

Revisions presented include suggestions made in regards to item 5 on page 6 by the members of the Student Ad Hoc Committee (Mr. Keith Davis, Mr. Jacob Anderson, and Mr. David Oberst) who were present at the September 13, 2006, State Board of Education meeting. The revisions include language on protecting the identity of the victims of bullying and that any oral reports of bullying should be documented for school records.

The State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education adopt the model policy.

Mrs. Seckinger had a question concerning the environmental factor in determining bullying. She stated that school climate and school culture should be consistent around the state. Mrs. Seckinger was concerned

that some districts will take the culture of the school and use it as a reason not to act on bullying and harassment, etc. She wanted to have school climate and school culture deleted. Ms. Mackinem stated that she felt that both of these were areas that needed to be looked at for remediation if bullying is an issue at the school. Mrs. Seckinger wanted to come to some more descriptive term instead of school culture/school climate. The goal is to have an excellent school culture and a really stimulating school environment. If we could just add an adjective to that wording.

Dr. Woodall stated the S.C. School Boards Association has a sample policy on the Web site. She asked if this model policy would be sent to the School Board Association again since this is very different than what they have on their site. Ms. Mackinem stated that she had talked with Ms. Pat Kinsey at the School Board Association and after first reading she was sent a copy of what passed, along with the suggestions from the Ad Hoc Committee. Dr. Woodall asked how this would be distributed to the districts. Dale Stuckey stated that this would be sent out from the State Department of Education.

Mr. Tindal stated that traditionally school districts rely on the School Board Association to draft sample policies for the districts and Dr. Woodall is correct in saying that there are some things that are not specifically mentioned in their sample policy.

Mr. DuBard expressed concern about the statement under Item 5, Model Policy Language, If requested, the identity of the victim will be protected to the extent allowed by law. How would a student know to ask for their identity to be protected? Ms. Mackinem stated that upon adoption of the policy, the principal should understand that it is their responsibility to let the victim know that. Mr. DuBard asked if we were going to keep the language "as requested." Dr. Woodall commented it is the principals responsibility to tell the person that this can be documented.

Dr Kristi Woodall made a motion to approve the recommendation that the State Board of Education adopt the model policy that will assist local school districts in the development of policies for the prevention of harassment, intimidation, or bullying. Mr. Charles McKinney seconded the motion.

Mrs. Seckinger moved that the language in Item 3 Model Policy Language be changed to "The district board of trustees expects students to conduct themselves in keeping with district standards of student behavior . . . Mrs. Maguire seconded the motion. The amendment carried.

The Board then voted on the original motion as amended. The motion carried.

05. Proposed State Board of Education Meeting Schedule Agenda for 2007

Joe Isaac, Chair, State Board of Education, presented this item for approval. Mr. Isaac stated that the schedule was prepared to establish meeting dates for the State Board of Education in 2007.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved to approve the meeting dates for the State Board of Education in 2007. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Isaac stated that the Student Ad Hoc Student Committee would be coming back next month. Chair Isaac stated that he discussed the Ad Hoc Student Committee with the incoming Chair, Mr. Tindal. Mr. Tindal felt that we still needed to have the Committee. Chair Isaac stated that next year every board member would nominate, if they choose to do so, someone from their district, to serve on the Student Advisory Committee. The Committee will meet twice a year and Mr. Tindal will set those dates. The Board will have a meeting Tuesday, prior to the Board meeting to meet specifically with these students on specific topics. This is helping them in sitting down with the Board and talk with them about their concerns. Prior to the December meeting, each Board member that wishes to do can nominate someone from his or her circuit. Please send your nominations to the Chair. I will then pass them on to the new Chair or Carol.

Chair stated that he knew that there was a lot of information and e-mails being sent to Board members on the Uniform Grading System. As Chair, Mr. Isaac asked that this go back on the agenda for next month, the purpose being to receive some type of communication with the education community. Chair Isaac stated that he would like to hear the repercussions if the Board continues with the policy, possibly from higher education on how they are going to deal with this issue. Chair Isaac feels more time is needed to hear from the education community and then address a possible amendment to the policy that was approved by the Board last month.

Ms. Sumpter asked if all of the e-mails received would be turned over to staff so they could begin looking at all of the concerns and issue an invitation to those persons letting them know we are readdressing this issue. Chair Isaac stated that everything he had received had already been sent to the Department. Ms. Sumpter asked if the group would know about the hearing next month. Chair Isaac stated that it would be in the agenda.

Mrs. Seckinger asked if someone who voted for this amendment should bring this back up. Ms. Kelly stated that this was a whole new item not a reconsideration of the item passed last month. The Board Chair has the authority to set the agenda. Ms. Kelly stated that it would be considering an amendment of the existing policy, which has been already approved. Mrs. Seckinger expressed concern over being able to do this. Mr. Tindal stated that there seems to be issues that need to be revisited.

Dr. Woodall asked what groups would be represented if this goes back on the agenda. Chair Isaac said that he hoped that all Board members would make contact with the people within their district before the next Board meeting and let them know what is happening.

Mrs. Maguire asked that we have it as a study session instead of an action item and we invite everyone who wants to talk and deal with the issue and talk among ourselves. Then if we decide as a Board that we want this as an agenda item we can put it on the Board in December.

Chair Isaac stated that he would have the study session on Uniform Grading at the November meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Educator Licensure Cases

The State Board of education held a meeting on Wednesday, October 11, 2006, in the Basement Conference Room of the Rutledge Office Building to discuss educator licensure cases. The following Board members were in attendance: Joe Isaac, Chair; John Tindal, Chair-Elect; Ms. Rebecca Burch; Mr. Jessie R. Curtis; Mr. Trip DuBard; Mr. Mike Forrester; Mrs. Kristin Maguire; Mr. Charles McKinney; Mr. Ben Mitchell; Mrs. Patsy Pye; Mrs. Terrye Seckinger; Dr. Danny Varat; Ms. Diane Sumpter; Ms. Virginia Wilson; and Dr. Kristi Woodall. Mr. Al Simpson and Mr. Ron Wilson were excused for their absences.

Chair-Elect Tindal brought the meeting to order and declared the Board in Executive Session.

Open Session

1. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education summarily suspend the certificate of David R. Thiem, certificate 215274, and adopt an Order of Summary Suspension on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Charles McKinney seconded the motion. The motion carried.
2. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board summarily suspend the certificate of David M. Wolfe, certificate 223299, and adopt an Order of Summary Suspension, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.
3. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Susanne T. Baxter, certificate 146660, for a period of three years, and approve the Consent Order of Suspension, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.
4. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Lawrence H. McCallum III, certificate 179546, for a period of two years, and approve the Consent Order of Suspension on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

5. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Bobby C. Neal, certificate 904213, for a period of fifteen months, and approve the Consent Order of Suspension, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.
6. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Kelly D. Zabel, certificate 204682, for a period of ten month, and approve the Consent Order of Suspension, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried. Ms. Diane Sumpter and Mr. Ben Mitchell abstained.
7. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board issue a public reprimand to Lenora Middleton Tucci, certificate 122796, and approve the Consent Order of Public Reprimand, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mrs. Terrye Seckinger seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Isaac declared the Board in Executive Session

Open Session

8. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education issue a certificate to John Phillip Cottle. Ms. Diane Sumpter seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Isaac declared the Board in Executive Session

Open Session

9. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education issue a certificate to David Joseph Lemargee. Mr. John Tindal seconded the motion. The motion carried with one opposing vote by Mrs. Terrye Seckinger.

XI. PUBLIC HEARING—CHARTER SCHOOL APPEALS

The State Board of Education held a public hearing to hear an appeal by the Thornwell Charter School of a Denial of a Charter by the Laurens County School District 56 Board of Trustees. Board members not in attendance were Mr. Ron Wilson, Mr. Al Simpson, and Mr. Trip DuBard. Mr. Charles McKinney recused himself from the hearing.

Geraldine Urbanic, Esquire, represented the State Department of Education.

David Gantt, Esquire, was given twenty minutes to present oral arguments on behalf of Thornwell Charter School, with five minutes of rebuttal.

Ken Childs, Esquire and William Halligan, Esquire, were given twenty minutes to present oral arguments on behalf of Laurens County School District 56 Board of Trustees.

Board members had an opportunity to question the parties.

Motion 1: Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education find that the Laurens District 56's School Board's denial of the school's charter application violate state law based upon the Board's determination that the facilities to be used by the school did not meet appropriate safety and health standards. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 7 to 6.

Votes Yes

1. Mike Forrester
2. Kristin Maguire
3. Terrye Seckinger
4. Danny Varat
5. John Tindal
6. Kristi Woodall
7. Joe Isaac

Votes No

1. Jessie Curtis
2. Virginia Wilson
3. Rebecca Burch
4. Ben Mitchell
5. Patsy Pye
6. Diane Sumpter

Board members absent: Mr. Al Simpson, Mr. Ron Wilson, and Mr. Trip DuBard
Board member recused: Mr. Charles McKinney
Chair Isaac voted to break the tie.

Motion 2: Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education find that the Laurens District 56 School Board's denial of the school's application violate state law based upon the Board's determination that the creation of the school would have an adverse impact on other students in the district. Mrs. Terrye Seckinger seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 7 to 5.

Votes Yes

1. Jessie Curtis
2. Mike Forrester
3. Kristin Maguire
4. Terrye Seckinger
5. Danny Varat
6. John Tindal
7. Virginia Wilson

Votes No

1. Rebecca Burch
2. Ben Mitchell
3. Patsy Pye
4. Diane Sumpter
5. Kristi Woodall

Board members absent: Mr. Al Simpson, Mr. Ron Wilson, and Mr. Trip DuBard
Board member recused: Mr. Charles McKinney
Chair Isaac did not vote.

Motion 3: Mrs. Kristi Maguire moved that the State Board of Education find that the Laurens District 56 School Board denial of the School's application violates state law based upon the Board's determination that the school's proposed budget was not economically sound. Dr. Danny Varat seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 7 to 5.

Votes Yes

1. Jessie Curtis
2. Mike Forrester
3. Kristin Maguire
4. Terrye Seckinger
5. Danny Varat
6. John Tindal
7. Kristi Woodall

Votes No

1. Rebecca Burch
2. Ben Mitchell
3. Patsy Pye
4. Diane Sumpter
5. Virginia Wilson

Board members absent: Mr. Al Simpson, Mr. Ron Wilson, and Mr. Trip DuBard
Board member recused: Mr. Charles McKinney
Chair Isaac did not vote.

Motion 4: Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education find that the Laurens District 56 School District's denial of the school's charter application violate state law based upon the Board's determination that the creation of the school constituted a "conversion" of a private school. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion failed with a vote of 8 to 4.

Votes Yes

1. Mike Forrester
2. Kristin Maguire
3. Terrye Seckinger
4. Danny Varat

Votes No

1. Rebecca Burch
2. Jessie Curtis
3. Ben Mitchell
4. Patsy Pye
5. John Tindal
6. Virginia Wilson
7. Kristi Woodall
8. Diane Sumpter

Board members absent: Mr. Al Simpson, Mr. Ron Wilson, and Mr. Trip DuBard
Board member recused: Mr. Charles McKinney
Chair Isaac did not vote.

Motion 5: Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education uphold the denial of a charter school to Thornwell Charter School. Mrs. Rebecca Burch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Votes Yes

1. Rebecca Burch
2. Jessie Curtis
3. Kristin Maguire
4. Patsy Pye
5. Ben Mitchell
6. Diane Sumpter
7. John Tindal
8. Virginia Wilson
9. Kristi Woodall

Votes No

1. Mike Forrester
2. Terrye Seckinger
3. Danny Varat

Board members absent: Mr. Al Simpson, Mr. Ron Wilson, and Mr. Trip DuBard

Board member recused: Mr. Charles McKinney

Chair Isaac did not vote.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 5:45 p.m.