

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MOLLY M. SPEARMAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION



Report Under S.C. Code § 59-18-1610

South Carolina General Assembly

Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act and Proviso 1A.12

December 31, 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction: Reporting Requirement	1
System for Providing Technical Assistance	1
Introduction and Background	1
Summary of the System for Providing Services and Technical Assistance to Districts.....	2
Potentially Underperforming	2
Priority Schools.....	3
Other Supports for Priority and Underperforming Schools and Districts.....	3
Table 1: Criteria used to determine each school’s tier ranking	4
Table 2: Priority School Points by Assigned Tier Indicator	4
Table 3: Priority School Tier Assigning Formula Based on Total Sum of Points.....	4
Table 4: Priority School Tier Ratings	4
Table 5: System for Providing Priority School Services and Technical Assistance.....	5
Table 6: Baseline Spring 2016 Data on Academic Achievement in Priority Elementary and Middle Schools.	7
Table 7: Baseline Spring Graduation and Achievement Data in Priority High Schools.	8
Table 8: Professional Development Days - 2016 School Report Card for Priority Schools ..	9
Table 9: Percentage of Agreement Among Teachers Regarding Professional Development	10
Table 10: 2016 Professional Development Days for Potentially Underperforming Districts	11
Program Contact Information	11

Introduction: Reporting Requirement

The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) provides the following report in compliance with S.C. Code § 59-18-1610, which reads in part as follows:

SECTION 2. (A) The State Department of Education shall develop a system for providing services and technical assistance to districts that shall include academic assistance and assistance with finances. The State Superintendent of Education shall report the design of the system to the General Assembly no later than December 31, 2016. Every year thereafter, the Superintendent shall report on the progress of the system in regard to assistance provided to the local school districts and data documenting the impact of the assistance on student academic achievement and on high school graduation rates.

(B) In addition to the provisions of subsection (A), the State Department of Education shall monitor the professional development of teachers, staff, and administrators in districts it determines are underperforming to ascertain what improvements and changes are necessary in accordance with the provisions of the Education Accountability Act. The department also shall monitor the operations of school boards in underperforming districts in order to determine if they are operating efficiently and effectively. These improvements and changes must be communicated to the school districts and other parties or entities involved.

This report contains a summary of the system for providing services and technical assistance to districts that shall include academic assistance and assistance with finances in compliance with the provisions of the Education Accountability Act (EAA) and a summary of the plan and baseline data to monitor the professional development of school staff.

System for Providing Technical Assistance

Introduction and Background

The EAA requires that the SCDE develop a system, and that the State Superintendent “report the design of the system to the General Assembly no later than December 31, 2016.” S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-1610. The statute requires that the system include:

- provision of services
- provision of technical assistance to districts
- provision of academic assistance
- provision of assistance with finances
- monitoring of professional development
- monitoring of efficiency and effectiveness of local school board operations
- communication of improvements and changes

Summary of the System for Providing Services and Technical Assistance to Districts

Currently, any school that received an absolute rating of “At Risk” on the 2014 state accountability report cards has been designated a “Priority School.” For 2016, the SCDE has also identified “potentially underperforming” schools and districts. 2016 Appropriations Act No. 284, Proviso 1A.85. The following summarizes the system.

Potentially Underperforming

- In response to the proviso and Act 281 of 2016, the following criteria are used to identify “potentially underperforming” schools and districts:
 - A district is identified as underperforming if it meets two or more of the following criteria:
 - A district 4-year graduation rate of less than 70 percent;
 - A district where the mean of percentage of students in Grades 3–8 scoring “Does Not Meet Expectations” on SC Ready ELA or Mathematics is greater than 50 percent;
 - A district with less than 20 percent of eligible students scoring a Silver or better on WorkKeys;
 - A district with less than 5 percent of students scoring 22 or higher on the ACT in Reading or Mathematics;
 - A high school will be identified as underperforming if the composite average in the following four criteria together ranks in the bottom 5 percent:
 - graduation rate;
 - percentage of juniors earning Silver or higher;
 - percentage of 11GR (cohort designation of students in their third year of high school regardless of their grade level) identified students achieving 22 on the ACT in Reading or Mathematics; and
 - percentage of students scoring C or higher on English 1 or Algebra 1.
 - Middle and elementary schools are clustered as one category and are identified as underperforming if the composite average of students scoring “Does Not Meet” on SC Ready ELA and Mathematics ranks in the bottom 5 percent.
 - If a school’s grade levels spans two school categories (Elementary and Middle or High) the school will be ranked in each of the categories and will be identified by its performance in the category in which the school achieved the lowest ranking. Stand-alone ninth grade academies will be combined with their corresponding high school.
- Proviso 1A.85 requires the SCDE to target additional technical assistance to schools and districts newly identified as “potentially underperforming.” The SCDE has applied the criteria above to identify these schools and districts. Schools and districts newly identified as “potentially underperforming” have been provided with the opportunity to apply for technical assistance funding to support their improvement efforts.
- “Potentially underperforming” schools and districts must complete a special project application, which includes an improvement plan, budget requests, timeline for implementation, and a project evaluation component. The application must demonstrate a clear connection between project goals and student outcomes.

Priority Schools

- A system of tiers has been developed for Priority Schools, based on a variety of indicators which include: achievement (accountability index), length of time the schools have had an absolute rating of “At Risk”, financial risk status, and accreditation status. (*See Table 1.*)
- Priority Schools are assigned points related to the status of each indicator. The sum of the total number of points places a Priority School into a designated tier. Schools in a declared state of emergency are automatically placed in Tier 4 status. (*See Tables 2 and 3.*)
- Priority Schools have been assigned tiers based on their indicators according to that system. (*See Table 4.*)
- Tiers of support and intervention are provided to schools and vary in intensity based on tier level and an analysis of the reasons for the school’s “At Risk” rating. Schools in higher tiers are provided with a higher degree of technical assistance than schools in lower tiers. (*See Table 5.*)
- Supports, interventions, and technical assistance vary and may include, for example -
 - professional development;
 - specialized support at the school and district level on collecting data;
 - assistance with accurate documentation;
 - ensuring districts and schools have strong, viable systems as it relates to;
 - financial record keeping,
 - management,
 - inputting accurate information into state-level databases; and
 - assistance with other needs to enhance the functionality of district or school systems.
- The SCDE may contract with individuals with specific expertise to provide these supports to districts and schools that require specialized finance, academic, or instructional assistance.

Other Supports for Priority and Underperforming Schools and Districts

- The SCDE’s Office of Audit Services monitors the annual financial audits of school districts, reviews findings by the auditors, compares findings across years, works with SCDE program areas to collect corrective action plans, and monitors implementation and compliance. In some instances the SCDE contracts for expert technical assistance to correct serious financial systems defects.
- The SCDE’s Office of School Transformation monitors student achievement and documents the impact of assistance on student academic achievement and on high school graduation rates. Baseline data, using summative assessment information from spring 2016, has been collected. (*See Tables 6 and 7.*)
- The SCDE also monitors the professional development of teachers, staff, and administrators in districts identified as underperforming to determine the improvements and changes needed. (*See Tables 8, 9, and 10.*) Priority Schools are receiving diagnostic reviews through AdvancED. One assessment is whether all staff members participate in a continuous program of professional learning. When these are complete for all priority schools,

additional baseline data on professional development will be collected from these diagnostic reviews.

- The SCDE also monitors the operation of school boards in underperforming districts. Training is provided through the South Carolina School Boards Association. Staff and contractors routinely attend the meetings of local boards with Priority Schools.

Table 1: Criteria used to determine each school’s tier ranking

Criteria	Defined
Achievement	Student test score performance on annual summative assessments
Accreditation	Annual assessment of certification, curriculum, and service compliance performance
Financial Risk	Assessment of internal controls, compliance with uniform grant guidelines, and annual audit results
School Rating	The length of time the school has been rated as At Risk on the annual school report card

Table 2: Priority School Points by Assigned Tier Indicator

Accountability Index Ranking of the Schools in the Bottom 5% on the Weighted Point Index	Accreditation Status <i>*Charters are excluded</i>	Financial Risk	Length of Consecutive Years in Priority Status
1 pt – top third	1 pt – Advised	1 pt – Low Risk	1 pt – 1 to 3 years
2 pts – middle third	2 pts – Warned	2 pts – Medium Risk	2 pts – 4 to 6 years
3 pts – bottom third	3 pts – Probation	3 pts – High Risk	3 pts – 7 or more years
	4 pts – Denied		

Table 3: Priority School Tier Assigning Formula Based on Total Sum of Points

Charter Tiered Point System	Non-Charter Tiered Point System
Tier 1 = Schools scoring between 1–3 points	Tier 1 = Schools scoring between 1–3 points
Tier 2 = Schools scoring between 4–6 points	Tier 2 = Schools scoring between 4–6 points
Tier 3 = Schools scoring between 7–9 points	Tier 3 = Schools scoring between 7–11 points
Tier 4 = State of emergency declared	Tier 4 = State of emergency declared

Table 4: Priority School Tier Ratings

District	School	Tier
Barnwell 19	Macedonia Elementary	1
Charleston	North Charleston Elem	1
Cherokee	Luther Vaughan Elem	1
Darlington	Washington Street Elem	1
Marlboro	Bennettsville Inter	1
Orangeburg 5	Rivelon Elementary	1
Richland 1	Carver Lyon Elementary	1

District	School	Tier
Richland 1	Watkins Nance	1
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Academy	1
Spartanburg 7	Mary H. Wright Elem	1
Sumter	Chestnut Oaks MS	1
Aiken	Lloyd Kennedy Charter	2
Cherokee	Mary Bramlett Elem	2
Clarendon 2	Phoenix	2
Hampton 2	Estill HS	2
Jasper	Hardeeville Elem	2
Lancaster	Clinton Elem	2
Lee	Bishopville Primary	2
Lee	Lower Lee Elem	2
Marlboro	Blenheim Elem/MS	2
Marlboro	Clio MS	2
Orangeburg 4	HKT Elem	2
Orangeburg 5	Robert E. Howard MS	2
Richland 1	C.A. Johnson HS	2
SCPCSD/Columbia	Imagine Columbia	2
Williamsburg	Hemingway M.B. Lee MS	2
York 3	The Palmetto School	2
Allendale	Allendale Elem	3
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax HS	3
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax MS	3
Charleston	Burns Elem	3
Charleston	Greg Mathis Charter	3
Charleston	N. Charleston HS	3
Hampton 2	Estill MS	3
Jasper	Hardeeville Ridgeland MS	3
Jasper	Ridgeland Elem	3
Lee	Lee Central MS	3
Florence 4	Brockington Elem	4
Florence 4	Johnson MS	4

Table 5: System for Providing Priority School Services and Technical Assistance

Category	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
Assessment of Leadership and Instruction	Diagnostic review completed to identify improvement priorities.	Diagnostic review completed to identify improvement priorities.	Diagnostic review completed to identify improvement priorities.	Diagnostic review completed to identify improvement priorities.

Category	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
On Site Support	Transformation Coach	Transformation Coach	Transformation Coach	Transformation Coach
School Improvement Planning	School Renewal Planning-strategies closely aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored by Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning-strategies closely aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored by Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning-strategies aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored more frequently by Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning-improvement strategies mutually agreed upon by SCDE and school/district and aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored at least weekly by Transformation Coach
Professional Development/ Technical Assistance Financial Services	Professional Development-Transformation Coach and/or various SCDE offices. Expert services provided on contractual basis as deemed necessary	Professional Development-Transformation Coach and/or various SCDE offices. Expert services provided on contractual basis as deemed necessary	Professional Development-Transformation Coach and/or various SCDE offices. Expert services provided on contractual basis as deemed necessary	Professional Development, Office of School Transformation on-site support, and support of Transformation Coach and various SCDE offices. Expert services provided on contractual basis as deemed necessary
Technical Assistance Funding	Autonomy on use of technical assistance funds	Mild SCDE guidance on use of technical assistance funds	Strong SCDE guidance and direction on use of technical assistance funds in consultation with school and district	SCDE guidance and direction on use of technical assistance funds in consultation with school and district
Finance Operations	Review of annual “December 1” audit, corrective	Review of annual “December 1” audit, corrective	Review of annual “December 1” audit, corrective	Review of annual “December 1” audit, corrective

Category	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
	action plans, and financial risk assessment	action plans, and financial risk assessment	action plans, and financial risk assessment	action plans, and financial risk assessment
Board Operations	Monitor training of local board members and attend meetings as needed	Monitor training of local board members and attend meetings as needed	Require training of local board members and attend meetings as needed	Require training of local board members and attend meetings frequently
Evaluation	Evaluation of impact of interventions and professional development on student achievement annually	Evaluation of impact of interventions and professional development on student achievement annually	Evaluation of impact of interventions and professional development on student achievement annually	Evaluation of impact of interventions and professional development on student achievement annually

Table 6: Baseline Spring 2016 Data on Academic Achievement in Priority Elementary and Middle Schools.

District	School	Percentage Scoring "Does Not Meet" in Mathematics on SC READY	Percentage Scoring "Does Not Meet" in ELA on SC READY
Florence 4	Brockington Elem	77.58	69.09
Jasper	Hardeeville-Ridgeland Middle	63.92	56.76
York 3	Palmetto School-Children's Attention Home	62.50	50.00
Jasper	Ridgeland Elem	62.17	64.52
Aiken	Lloyd/Kennedy Charter	60.71	45.24
SC Public Charter School District	Imagine Columbia Leadership Academy	60.66	52.46
Charleston	Edmund A Burns Elem	60.27	59.82
Richland 1	Watkins-Nance Elem	60.14	42.57
Orangeburg 4	Hunter-Kinard Tyler Elem	59.06	53.69
Florence 4	Johnson Middle	57.50	54.17
Jasper	Hardeeville Elem	56.76	50.89
Orangeburg 5	Robert E. Howard Middle	55.52	48.58
Lee	Lower Lee Elem	53.10	46.90
Allendale	Allendale-Fairfax Middle	52.02	43.35
Sumter	Chestnut Oaks Middle	51.94	40.97
Lee	Lee Central Middle	51.71	49.02

District	School	Percentage Scoring "Does Not Meet" in Mathematics on SC READY	Percentage Scoring "Does Not Meet" in ELA on SC READY
Cherokee	Mary Bramlett Elem	51.24	53.72
Allendale	Allendale Elem	50.75	52.08
Hampton 2	Estill Middle	50.34	45.64
Lancaster	Clinton Elem	48.50	49.70
Cherokee	Luther L. Vaughan Elem	48.30	52.38
Marlboro	Blenheim Elem/Middle	47.89	45.98
Richland 1	Carver-Lyon Elem	47.73	44.70
Spartanburg 7	Mary H. Wright Elem	47.09	44.97
Marlboro	Bennettsville Intermediate	46.37	51.92
Charleston	North Charleston Elem	46.37	48.18
Marlboro	Clio Elem/Middle	41.75	36.89
Lee	Bishopville Primary	40.66	42.86
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Academy of Leadership	39.69	41.03
Barnwell19	Macedonia Elem	38.66	42.78
Williamsburg	Hemingway M.B. Lee Middle	32.80	33.33
Darlington	Washington St. Elem	30.43	44.57
Orangeburg 5	Rivelon Elem	22.37	40.79

Table 7: Baseline Spring Graduation and Achievement Data in Priority High Schools.

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	Graduate Percentage		Composite Average of the percentage of students scoring C or higher on English 1 and Algebra 1		Percentage of 11GR identified students achieving 22 on ACT Reading or Mathematics		Percentage of juniors earning Silver or higher on WorkKeys;	
		2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax High	85.4	80.4	14.4	17.8	0	3	18.5	29
Hampton 2	Estill High	87.0	77.2	11.2	18.5	0	4	11.4	25
Richland 1	CA Johnson High	53.2	72.7	32.2	27.1	0	3	25.8	29
Charleston	N Charleston High	65.6	68.8	51.1	37.1	0	6	36.1	25
Charleston	Greg Mathis	29.5	19.1	3.8	6.8	0	0	66.6	21

	Charter High								
Clarendon 2	Phoenix Charter High	41.2	50	0	7.1	0	0	18.2	14

Table 8: Professional Development Days - 2016 School Report Card for Priority Schools

District	School	Professional Development Days Per Teacher 2016
Aiken	Lloyd Kennedy Charter	23.8
Allendale	Allendale Elem	6.6
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax HS	7.2
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax MS	13.9
Barnwell 19	Macedonia Elementary	12
Charleston	Burns Elem	12.1
Charleston	Greg Mathis Charter	11.5
Charleston	N. Charleston HS	4.9
Charleston	North Charleston Elem	9.9
Cherokee	Luther Vaughan Elem	7.3
Cherokee	Mary Bramlett Elem	17
Clarendon 2	Phoenix Charter	5
Darlington	Washington Street Elem	25.5
Florence 4	Brockington Elem	3.8
Florence 4	Johnson MS	4.7
Hampton 2	Estill HS	4
Hampton 2	Estill MS	5.3
Jasper	Hardeeville Elem	13.5
Jasper	Hardeeville Ridgeland MS	11.8
Jasper	Ridgeland Elem	8
Lancaster	Clinton Elem	19.8
Lee	Bishopville Primary	N/A
Lee	Lee Central MS	2.6
Lee	Lower Lee Elem	N/A
Marlboro	Bennettsville Inter	2.1
Marlboro	Blenheim Elem/MS	2.8
Marlboro	Clio MS	1.4
Orangeburg 4	HKT Elem	5.3
Orangeburg 5	Rivelon Elementary	2.3
Orangeburg 5	Robert E. Howard MS	2.8
Richland 1	C.A. Johnson HS	22.9
Richland 1	Carver Lyon Elementary	10.1
Richland 1	Watkins Nance	12.9
SCPCSD/Columbia	Imagine Columbia	14.4
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Academy	17.3

District	School	Professional Development Days Per Teacher 2016
Spartanburg 7	Mary H. Wright Elem	17
Sumter	Chestnut Oaks MS	6
Williamsburg	Hemingway M.B. Lee MS	12.8
York 3	The Palmetto School	N/A

Table 9: Percentage of Agreement Among Teachers Regarding Professional Development

District	School	Percentage of agreement among teachers on the annual climate survey item: “There are relevant professional development opportunities offered to teachers at my school.”
Aiken	Lloyd Kennedy Charter	40
Allendale	Allendale Elem	66.7
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax HS	37.0
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax MS	46.7
Barnwell 19	Macedonia Elementary	52.6
Charleston	Burns Elem	77.4
Charleston	Greg Mathis Charter	No responses recorded
Charleston	N. Charleston HS	62.2
Charleston	North Charleston Elem	26.3
Cherokee	Luther Vaughan Elem	64.3
Cherokee	Mary Bramlett Elem	72.2
Clarendon 2	Phoenix Charter	No responses recorded
Darlington	Washington Street Elem	80
Florence 4	Brockington Elem	8.7
Florence 4	Johnson MS	No responses recorded
Hampton 2	Estill HS	43.5
Hampton 2	Estill MS	No responses recorded
Jasper	Hardeeville Elem	51.0
Jasper	Hardeeville Ridgeland MS	57.1
Jasper	Ridgeland Elem	21.7
Lancaster	Clinton Elem	50
Lee	Bishopville Primary	29.6
Lee	Lee Central MS	42.5
Lee	Lower Lee Elem	26.7
Marlboro	Bennettsville Inter	No responses recorded
Marlboro	Blenheim Elem/MS	No responses recorded
Marlboro	Clio MS	No responses recorded
Orangeburg 4	HKT Elem	45.8
Orangeburg 5	Rivelon Elementary	61.1

District	School	Percentage of agreement among teachers on the annual climate survey item: “There are relevant professional development opportunities offered to teachers at my school.”
Orangeburg 5	Robert E. Howard MS	57.9
Richland 1	C.A. Johnson HS	54.2
Richland 1	Carver Lyon Elementary	48.6
Richland 1	Watkins Nance	41.9
SCPCSD/Columbia	Imagine Columbia	No responses recorded
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Academy	62.5
Spartanburg 7	Mary H. Wright Elem	59.0
Sumter	Chestnut Oaks MS	47.4
Williamsburg	Hemingway M.B. Lee MS	69.2
York 3	The Palmetto School	No responses recorded

Table 10: 2016 Professional Development Days for Potentially Underperforming Districts

District	Professional Development Days
Allendale	8.2
Florence 4	4.4
Jasper	9.4
Lee	4.1

Program Contact Information

Francina Gerald, Education Associate
Office of School Transformation
803-734-1938
fgerald@ed.sc.gov

Dr. Latoya Dixon, Director
Office of School Transformation
803-734-5849
ldixon@ed.sc.gov

Dr. Sheila Quinn, Deputy Superintendent
Division of Innovation & Effectiveness
803-734-7897
squinn@ed.sc.gov