

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as  
amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN**



**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA**



For submission to the  
U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
October 13, 2017

OMB Number: 1810-0576  
Expiration Date: September 30, 2017

## Contents

Cover Page .....	iii
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) .....	4
1. Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments .....	4
2. Eighth Grade Math Exception .....	4
3. Native Language Assessments .....	5
4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities .....	7
i. Subgroups .....	7
ii. Minimum N-Size .....	8
iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals .....	9
iv. Indicators .....	18
v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation .....	69
vi. Identification of Schools .....	75
vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement .....	79
viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement .....	79
5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators .....	86
6. School Conditions .....	88
7. School Transitions .....	90
B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children .....	103
1. Supporting Needs of Migratory Children .....	103
2. Promote Coordination of Services .....	117
3. Use of Funds .....	118
C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk .....	120
1. Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs .....	120
2. Program Objectives and Outcomes .....	120
D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction .....	123
1. Use of Funds .....	123
2. Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools .....	123
3. System of Certification and Licensing .....	124
4. Improving Skills of Educators .....	125
5. Data and Consultation .....	131
6. Teacher Preparation .....	132
E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement ...	133

1. Entrance and Exit Procedures .....	133
2. SEA Support for English Learner Progress .....	133
3. Monitoring and Technical Assistance.....	134
F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants .....	136
1. Use of Funds .....	136
2. Awarding Subgrants.....	136
G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers .....	137
1. Use of Funds .....	137
2. Awarding Subgrants.....	137
H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program .....	139
I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B .....	141
1. Student Identification.....	141
2. Dispute Resolution.....	143
3. Support for School Personnel .....	144
4. Access to Services.....	145
5. Strategies to Address Other Problems .....	149
6. Policies to Remove Barriers.....	151
7. Assistance from Counselors.....	151
Appendix A: Exit Survey Data from SCDE ESSA Meetings.....	153
Appendix B: South Carolina Stakeholder Outreach .....	156
Appendix C: SCDE Response to Stakeholder Feedback.....	168
Appendix D: Measurements of Interim Progress.....	170
Appendix E: Disproportionality within Schools Served under Title I, Part A .....	193
Appendix F: Special School Packet.....	194
Appendix G: Report Elements on Report Cards.....	225
Appendix H: GEPA Section 427 Statement .....	231
Appendix I: Glossary of Acronyms .....	232

Contact Information and Signatures	
<b>SEA Contact (Name and Position):</b>  Karla M. Hawkins, Deputy Superintendent Division of Federal, State, and Community Resources	<b>Telephone:</b>  803-734-7078
<b>Mailing Address:</b>  1429 Senate Street, Room 505 Columbia, SC 29201	<b>Email Address:</b>  <a href="mailto:khawkins@ed.sc.gov">khawkins@ed.sc.gov</a>
<p>By signing this document, I assure that:  To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.  The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.  Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.</p>	
<b>Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)</b>  Molly M. Spearman South Carolina State Superintendent of Education	<b>Telephone:</b>  803-734-8500
<b>Signature of Authorized SEA Representative</b>  	<b>Date:</b>  October 13, 2017
<b>Governor (Printed Name)</b>  Henry McMaster Governor of South Carolina	<b>Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540:</b>  August 4, 2017
<b>Signature of Governor</b>  	<b>Date:</b>  October 13, 2017

## **Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan**

*Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.*

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

**or**

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:


- ☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- ☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- ☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- ☐ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- ☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- ☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- ☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- ☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

## **Instructions**

*Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.*

## Introduction

South Carolina is an ambitious state. Despite one of the highest poverty rates in the nation, South Carolina is determined to work its way to the forefront of twenty-first century industry while ensuring that its citizens – rural and urban – have equitable access to opportunity. Education plays a critical role in this upward climb for each and every South Carolinian, and we, as a citizenry, are united around what is necessary for all South Carolina students to succeed. Organizations as diverse as the South Carolina Association of School Administrators (SCASA), the South Carolina Council on Competitiveness, and the South Carolina General Assembly have come together to adopt the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate (the Profile) as a common vision for all South Carolina children, beginning with Pre–K education and continuing through college and careers. The Profile outlines the world-class knowledge, world-class skills, and life and career characteristics necessary for children and our state to be successful in the global marketplace.



The Profile is the foundation for the **mission** of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE), which is that **all South Carolina students graduate prepared for success in college, careers, and citizenship**. This mission drives all agency activity, from the design of its integrated accountability system, to revision of the state's diploma pathways, to the streamlining of teacher certification processes.

## SCDE Strategic Initiatives

The SCDE has built a state-level framework that connects agency work to statewide student learning and to achievement of the Profile to support the agency's mission. Agency goals are focused around three main strategic initiatives—personalized and competency-based learning, expanded learning, and school improvement.

### *Personalized and Competency-Based Learning*

Personalized learning supports *all* students as they seek to achieve the knowledge, skills, and characteristics identified in the Profile. By fostering student ownership of learning, by restructuring learning around quality evidence of competence, by developing learner profiles and learning pathways,

and by adopting flexible learning environments, each student's educational experience is tailored to meet his or her unique strengths, needs, and interests. The SCDE is working with all South Carolina local education agencies (LEAs) across a variety of personalized and competency-based learning models to ensure that every school district in the state includes at least one school fully committed to personalized and competency-based learning.

#### *Expanded Learning*

All students must have the opportunity to develop world-class knowledge, world-class skills, and life and career characteristics. Providing this opportunity requires a diversity of options outside the traditional school day or building. Ensuring that all students – not just those in high income, high capacity school districts – have access to career and technical education, virtual options, world languages, the arts, advanced credit in middle school, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and dual credit coursework is critical to achieving the SCDE's mission. The SCDE is working to increase the number of students achieving industry credentials and to increase the number of students earning a silver certificate or higher on the National Career Readiness Certificate; is partnering with high-need schools to supply needed virtual programming; and is increasing the professional learning support that teachers need to provide world-class content. The state is committed to early childhood education as a way to support kindergarten readiness before school even begins. Community partnerships, especially with the faith-based community, are an important component of supporting opportunity and success in expanded learning options for students. The SCDE is working to measure, support, and increase high-quality expanded learning opportunities and partnerships across the state.

#### *School Improvement*

Educational success should not be a function of zip code or history. In the 2016–17 academic year, South Carolina instituted a tiered support system and the use of transformation coaches for identified high-need schools. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), these schools are designated for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). Instead of allowing schools and LEAs to flounder on their own, the SCDE is providing direct support and guidance based on a portfolio of evidence-based school turnaround strategies. The SCDE is not afraid to take management of long-term failing schools identified for the top tier of intervention, and all interventions are implemented with the goal of building local success and capacity for long-term positive change. Furthermore, school improvement across the state is supported by having all LEAs engage in high-quality systems review and accreditation and by ensuring that the state has a world-class accountability system and a central data warehouse that can be used across programs to improve educational processes and outcomes. The SCDE is working to improve data feedback loops and reporting with all LEAs while focusing attention on improving student academic performance in LEAs and schools that are identified as low-performing.

Three additional strategic initiatives revolve around LEA support, individual educator support, and internal excellence. To support innovation in educational systems internally and across the state, the SCDE has instituted indicators of quality and a strong continuous improvement process to ensure successful delivery of strategic initiatives. The SCDE indicators of quality, in the form of evidence- and research-based rubrics, inform overall agency and individual office self-assessment. These indicators are:

- *Return on Investment:* Educational productivity including efficient achievement of educational outcomes and the institution of strong, equitable fiscal processes;
- *Fidelity:* Knowledge of and adherence to law, guidance, and program design;
- *Stakeholder Feedback and Satisfaction:* Communication and implementation that is perceived as purposeful, responsive to stakeholder needs, two-way, supportive, and impactful; and

- *Effectiveness*: Educational productivity, including efficient achievement of educational outcomes and program effectiveness, as well as the institution of strong, equitable fiscal processes and risk management.

The SCDE believes that strategic initiatives guided by these indicators of quality will result in strong statewide learning outcomes that will ensure that all students meet the Profile and graduate prepared for success in college, careers, and citizenship.

Throughout development of its ESSA consolidated state plan, the SCDE has worked to ensure strong communication and consultation with diverse stakeholders across the state. Exit survey data from three statewide stakeholder meetings provided in Appendix A demonstrates that stakeholders grew in their understanding and engagement with ESSA over time and viewed the SCDE's consultation process favorably. Appendix B documents the SCDE's outreach at more than 120 meetings between October 2015, and October 2017, and Appendix C provides a summary of the SCDE's responses to stakeholder feedback.



## A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

1. Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments (*ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.*)<sup>1</sup>
2. Eighth Grade Math Exception (*ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4)*):
  - i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?  
☐ Yes  
☒ No (Currently, but under discussion with State Board of Education.)
  - ii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
    - a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
    - b. The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
    - c. In high school:
      1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR §200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR §200.6(b) and (f); and
      3. The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.  
☐ Yes  
☒ No
  - iii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR §200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

3. Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)) and (f)(4):

- i. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

In South Carolina the “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” include languages that are equal to or greater than 1.5 percent of the overall percentage of English learners (EL) statewide. The top five languages are Spanish, which makes up roughly 82 percent of the overall population of EL, and Russian, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Arabic, which each comprise 1.5 percent or greater of the remaining 18 percent of the total EL population statewide.

- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

No existing assessments are administered in languages other than English. The state provides instruction to EL in English and therefore administers all academic assessments in English.

- iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

~~Student academic assessments in languages other than English are not needed. ELs are taught in English. Assessments must be administered in the language of instruction for test scores to be valid.~~

English language is the official language of the State of South Carolina (Code of Laws §§1–1–696). The law is posted at [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=696&category=CODEOFLAWS&conid=9087040&result\\_pos=0&keyval=10691&numrows=10](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=696&category=CODEOFLAWS&conid=9087040&result_pos=0&keyval=10691&numrows=10).

The Education Accountability Act (Code of Laws §§59–18–310), posted at <http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t59c018.php>, states the following: “Assessments required to be developed or adopted pursuant to the provisions of this section or chapter must be objective and reliable, and administered in English and in Braille for students as identified in their Individual Education Plan.” The assessments required by this section are the tests in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in grades three through eight and end-of-course tests for courses selected by the State Board of Education (i.e., English, Algebra, Biology, and US History and the Constitution).

Accommodations are allowed as prescribed in the student’s ELL plan. These accommodations include the use of bilingual dictionaries, rewording and translation of directions, oral administration for all tests except the reading portion of any ELA assessment. Evidence is available in Appendix D of the Test Administration Manuals (TAMs) posted at <https://ed.sc.gov/tests/tests->

[files/scpass-files/2018-scpass-and-sc-ready-test-administration-manual/](http://files/scpass-files/2018-scpass-and-sc-ready-test-administration-manual/) and <http://ed.sc.gov/tests/tests-files/eocep-files/eocep-spring-2017-test-administration-manual-tam/>. Additional evidence is posted at: <https://ed.sc.gov/policy/federal-education-programs/esea-title-iii/children-who-are-both-lep-and-special-education-students-memo/>

- iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
- a. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);

~~The state does not plan to administer assessments in any language other than English.~~

English language is the official language of the State of South Carolina (Code of Laws §§1–1–696). The law is posted at [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=696&category=CODEOFLAWS&conid=9087040&result\\_pos=0&keyval=10691&numrows=10](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=696&category=CODEOFLAWS&conid=9087040&result_pos=0&keyval=10691&numrows=10).

The Education Accountability Act (Code of Laws §§59–18–310), posted at <http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t59c018.php>, states the following: “Assessments required to be developed or adopted pursuant to the provisions of this section or chapter must be objective and reliable, and administered in English and in Braille for students as identified in their Individual Education Plan.” The assessments required by this section are the tests in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in grades three through eight and end-of-course tests for courses selected by the State Board of Education (i.e., English, Algebra, Biology, and US History and the Constitution).

- b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of ELs; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

Tests scores can only be valid if instruction is provided to give the student the opportunity to learn the information. Students are not provided the opportunity to learn content in languages other than English, so testing them in other languages would not result in valid test scores.

Section 59-18-300 of the state's Education Accountability Act (EAA) states: “The standards are to promote the goals of providing every student with the competencies to (1) read, view, and listen to complex information in the English language; (2) write and speak effectively in

the English language.” The tests are aligned to the state academic standards; therefore the tests measure students’ abilities to read and write in English for all subjects. The EAA requires tests of English/language arts and section 59-18-325 defines English/language arts as including “English, reading, and writing skills.”

- c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

The state has always planned to develop all assessments in English. Student academic assessments in languages other than English are not needed. ELs are taught in English. Assessments must be administered in the language of instruction for test scores to be valid.

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

i. Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)):

- a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, White, African American, Hispanic, EL, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American.

- b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and EL) used in the Statewide accountability system.

South Carolina will not use other subgroups in the accountability metrics.

The state will report assessment subgroup performance for migrant, foster, military-connected, gifted and talented (GT), and homeless on the Achievement section of the report card to document performance on summative assessments.

- c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student’s results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.

☒ Yes

☐ No

- d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

- ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
- ☒ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or
- ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

ii. Minimum N-Size (*ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)*):

- a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

Subgroups with n-sizes of 20 will be reported for the purposes of accountability. This number represents a reduction in the n-size used previously under the ESEA waiver, which was 30 students.

- b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

South Carolina chose the n-size of 20 for subgroup reporting to balance the need for transparency of student performance in a majority of schools with the need to assure that the sample size adequately protects personally identifiable information and reflects the characteristics of the school as a whole. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NECS) released a report in 2011 detailing that states could set n-sizes of 10 while still providing reliable data and protecting student identity; however, in some small, rural schools in the state, an n-size of 10 would not adequately protect student privacy. Additionally, the smaller the group, the less reliable the data are. Volatility of the data will be greater from year-to-year when reporting groups with smaller n-sizes.

- c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

South Carolina previously used subgroup n-counts of 40 (1999–05) and 30 (2005–14); however, based on stakeholder feedback from the Urban League, Hispanic Alliance, and other civil rights groups, the state will use an n-size of 20 for the ESSA reporting and accountability. These organizations maintained that a smaller n-size would allow more schools to be included in the full reporting of subgroup performance. Feedback from community stakeholders suggested “reporting” n-sizes at 10 and “counting” n-sizes of 30. Additionally, district superintendent and instructional leader roundtable groups advocated for subgroup n-sizes of 40 or for a percentage model whereby a subgroup would be reported if it met a specific percentage threshold of the full population. These requests

were grounded in a desire to increase validity and reliability and reduce deceptive or misleading interpretations that arise from small sample sizes. The SCDE considered all of these recommendations and selected a compromise of reporting and setting performance targets for subgroups with n-sizes of 20. South Carolina has seen tremendous achievement gaps for specific student groups including economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and African American students. One way to fully embrace academic improvement for these students in the early grades is to ensure subgroup performances are reported in elementary schools where in the past, smaller student populations have gone unreported when using n-sizes 30 or higher for subgroups.

- d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.<sup>2</sup>

South Carolina masks all data with subgroups of less than 20 and will mask calculations that result in 0 or 100 percent for a subgroup reported in a particular category.

- e. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

South Carolina will use the same minimum number of students for accountability and reporting.

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):

**South Carolina Goal-Setting Definitions & Methodology**

Long term goals: Baselines for the new multi-metric *South Carolina Succeeds* accountability model will be set from results of the 2017 interim report card. Therefore, subsequent movement towards state and federal long-term goals will be monitored from 2018–2035. Students born in 2017–18 will graduate in 2035. Stakeholders, including the State Board of Education (SBE), Education Oversight Committee (EOC), SCASA, Palmetto State Teachers Association, SC Education Association, Columbia Urban League, and others agreed that this timespan represents a generational approach to the transformational goals South Carolina has set for its education system.

---

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

Mid-point benchmarks: A mid-term (2026) benchmark will outline for the state, districts, and schools a half-way point or 50 percent improvement in identified areas of achievement, graduation rate, and English proficiency, and college and career readiness for ALL students and for individual subgroups. The interim target methodology allows for each organizational level (state, district, school) to establish a 2017 baseline that is unique to each entity and to develop improvement targets from its unique starting point to the 2026 mid-point benchmark.

Interim targets: From the 2017 baseline, South Carolina will set six three-year interim targets that outline the improvement the state, districts, and schools need to make toward the 2035 long-range goals. To allow for strategic school improvement efforts and sustained interventions, ambitious interim targets will be set on a three-year cycle to reflect expected outcomes by the 2020, 2023, 2026 (mid-point), 2029, 2032, and 2035 school years respectively. Results for each ESSA sub-goal will be reported annually alongside the three-year interim target for that sub-goal for ALL students and for individual subgroups so that stakeholders may see the current performance and the interim target for the school, district, or state.

The tiered model described above will provide a structure of continuous improvement for district strategic plans and for school renewal plans and will promote a multi-year approach to improvement efforts. The model will also provide a common process for setting improvement targets for all districts and schools.

## South Carolina Transformational Goals and Benchmarks

To meet the Profile of the South Carolina Graduate (the Profile), the state will set two overarching long term goals and report on the progress of key indicators along the continuum of a student’s journey through the educational system from birth through career.


### Goal One

By 2035, 90 percent of students will graduate “college, career, and citizenship ready” as outlined in the *Profile of the South Carolina Graduate*.

### Goal Two

Beginning with the 2020 graduating class, the state, each district, and each high school should increase by five percent annually the percentage of students who graduate ready to enter postsecondary education to pursue a degree or national industry credential without the need for remediation in mathematics or English.

## Statewide Leading Metrics





- a. Academic Achievement. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))
1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

**ESSA Achievement Sub-goal: By 2035,**

- 90 percent of students will score at Level 2 or higher in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics **(individually)**. (See levels in table below).

*Strategic Interim target: By 2026, reduce by 50 percent from the 2017 baseline the number of students scoring at Level 1.*

- 70 percent of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA and mathematics **(individually)**.

*Strategic Interim Target: By 2026, reduce by 50 percent from the 2017 baseline the number of students scoring below Level 3.*

Any subgroup with 2017 baseline performance above the State long-term goal targets will have differentiated, consistent higher targets to provide high expectations and continuous improvement for all student groups. (E.g., Asian/Pacific long-term goal for Level 2 or higher = 95%; Asian/Pacific long-term goal for Level 3 or higher = 80%)

In 2018, South Carolina will be fully transitioned from prior assessments that were reported at five performance levels in grades 3–8 ELA, math, science, and social studies to new assessments reported at four performance levels in these subjects. The cut scores that mark the four performance levels are rigorous college- and career-ready achievement standards. High school End of Course Examination Programs (EOCEP) will continue to be reported at five levels; however, the same college- and career-ready achievement levels were applied to English 1, Algebra 1, Biology 1, and U.S. History. For the purposes of goal setting, the chart below outlines levels that South Carolina will use to monitor and report performance. The chart also bridges the former five levels with the current four levels.

### Test Score Levels – EOCEPs, SCPASS, SC READY, and SC-ALT

	High School EOCEPs	Elementary/Middle SCPASS Levels	Elementary/Middle SC READY Levels	Elementary/Middle SC-ALT Levels
	ELA, Math Science, Social Studies	Science and Social Studies	ELA and mathematics	ELA and mathematics
Level 1	F	Not Met 1	Does Not Meet	Emerging
Level 2	D	Not Met 2	Approaches	Foundational
Level 3	C	Met	Meets	Increasing
Level 4	B	Exemplary 4	Exceeds	Applied
Level 5	A	Exemplary 5		

- i. See Appendix D for grade level achievement baselines for ELA and mathematics.
- ii. Timeline for meeting Achievement goal:
  - 2017 Baseline ELA and mathematics
  - 2026 Mid-term 50 percent reduction from the baseline in students scoring at Level 1 or 2 for all students and all subgroups
- iii. Ambitious Targets for ELA and mathematics achievement: Based on 2015–16 ELA and mathematics achievement data:
  - 5 percent of schools had at least 70 percent scoring Level 3 (Meets Expectations or higher) in ELA.
  - 6 percent of schools had at least 70 percent scoring Level 3 (Meets Expectations or higher) in mathematics.
  - 2 percent of schools had at least 70 percent scoring Level 3 or higher in ELA and mathematics.
  - Differentiated long-term goals and interim targets are provided for higher performing subgroups

Students scoring at Level 1 on state assessments are in the lowest performance category. These students are not on a trajectory for college or career readiness. One key focus for South Carolina is to reduce the number of students scoring in Level 1 on summative tests. Therefore, 90 percent at Level 2 or higher will be reported in the state's goals.

Level 2 on the high school EOCEP English 1 and Algebra 1 was aligned to the Silver or higher benchmark on the Reading for Information and Applied Mathematics score on the WorkKeys assessment. Students scoring Level 2 or higher will be on track for career-ready metrics.

Students scoring at Level 3 on state assessments are meeting the rigorous college- and career-grade level standards. Therefore, South Carolina will place significant emphasis on increasing the number of students who score Level 3 or higher on summative tests.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement. *Appendix D provides baselines for Level 2 and Level 3 percentages by grade level in ELA and mathematics for all students and subgroups as evidence of State's current performance. It also includes state (Grade 3 – high school) ELA and mathematics baselines, long term goals, and interim targets for ALL students and for all accountability subgroups.* The tables below provide examples of how South Carolina will present achievement long term goals and interim targets in ELA and math separately for all students and for subgroups (see students with disabilities subgroup below as a model).

**ALL Students (Ex. State All Students baseline, goal, interim targets):**

**South Carolina Achievement – 90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (2.63)
Gr 3–HS	74.2%	90%	15.8	7.9 (82.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.8% Y6 Target (2023) = 79.5% Midpoint (2026) = 82.1%

**South Carolina Achievement – 90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in mathematics**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (2.37)
Gr 3–HS	75.8%	90%	14.2	7.1 (82.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 78.2% Y6 Target (2023) = 80.6% Midpoint (2026) = 82.9%

**South Carolina Achievement – 70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (4.46)
Gr 3–HS	43.2%	70%	26.8	13.4 (56.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 47.7% Y6 Target (2023) = 52.1% Midpoint (2026) = 56.6%

**South Carolina Achievement – 70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in mathematics**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (4.0)
Gr 3–HS	46.0%	70%	24.0	12.0 (58.0%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 50.0% Y6 Target (2023) = 54.0% Midpoint (2026) = 58.0%

**Subgroups: (Ex. State Students with Disabilities Subgroup baselines, goals, and interim targets):**

**South Carolina Achievement – 90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (9.96)
Students with Disabilities Gr3-HS	30.2%	90%	59.8	29.9 (60.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 40.1% Y6 Target (2023) = 50.1% Midpoint (2026) = 60.1%

**South Carolina Achievement – 90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in mathematics**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (8.83)
Students with Disabilities Gr3-HS	37.1%	90%	52.9	26.5(63.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 45.9% Y6 Target (2023) = 54.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (8.83) Midpoint (2026) = 63.6%
-------------	------	-----------	----------	-------------	--

**South Carolina Achievement – 70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (10.2) Y3 Target (2020) = 19.2% Y6 Target (2023) = 29.4% Midpoint (2026) = 39.5%
Students with Disabilities Gr 3–HS	9%	70%	61	30.5 (39.5%)	

**South Carolina Achievement – 70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in mathematics**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target (9.57) Y3 Target (2020) = 22.3% Y6 Target (2023) = 31.8% Midpoint (2026) = 41.4%
Students with Disabilities Gr 3–HS	12.7%	70%	57.3	28.7 (41.4%)	

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

South Carolina has set very rigorous college and career achievement standards on all state summative assessments. The state will measure all students and each subgroup using a common target methodology. Each subgroup will document the achievement baseline in 2017. Each subgroup will seek to reduce the percentage of students not at Level 2 (Approaches Expectations) and not at Level 3 (Meets Expectations) by 50 percent at the 2026 midpoint. Holding all subgroups to the same improvement percentage as ALL students will help South Carolina make significant progress in reducing its achievement gaps with historically underperforming students. The subgroups reported will be economically disadvantaged, African American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, EL, and students with disabilities.

b. Graduation Rate. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

ESSA Graduation Rate Sub-goal: By 2035,

- 90 percent of students will graduate in four years based on South Carolina's four-year adjusted cohort model.

*Strategic interim target:* By 2026, reduce by 50 percent from the 2017 baseline the number of students who do not graduate in four years.

- i. See Appendix D for graduation baselines.
- ii. Timeline for meeting graduation goal:
  - 2017 Graduation rate baseline (84.6 percent still being determined; 2016 rate was 82.6 percent).
  - 2026 50 percent reduction in the distance between the baseline graduation rate and the state target graduation rate of 90 percent for all students and all accountability subgroups.

- iii. Ambitious target for graduation goal:

South Carolina has seen steady improvements in graduation rates for the last five years to a 2016 high of 82.6 percent. Twenty-five percent of high schools in the state have graduation rates of 90 percent or higher. Schools or districts with graduation rates above the 90 percent state goal must set a more ambitious graduation target (e.g. 95 percent goal) even if they earn an excellent rating in the graduation rate category in the accountability model.

However, graduation rates for students with disabilities, American Indian students, and ELs have lagged behind other subgroups. Graduation rate results will be reported for ALL students and subgroups annually alongside the three-year interim target so that stakeholders may see the current performance and the interim target for the state, district, or school. This model will provide a consistent structure of continuous improvement for district strategic plans and for school renewal plans, which take a multi-year approach to improvement.

- 2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (iv) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Not applicable (NA): South Carolina will not report, nor count an extended graduation rate.

- 3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and

any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix D.

**South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.<sup>3</sup>**

Target Area	% 4yr Graduate	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	82.6%	90%	7.4 points	3.7 points (86.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 83.8% Y6 Target (2023) = 85.1% Mid-point (2026) = 86.3%

4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

South Carolina will measure all students and each subgroup using a common target methodology. Each subgroup's graduation rate baseline is the rate determined in 2017. Each subgroup will seek to reduce the percentage of students not graduating within four years by 50 percent at the 2026 midpoint. Holding all subgroups to the same improvement percentage as ALL students will help South Carolina make significant progress in reducing its achievement gaps with historically underperforming students. The subgroups reported will be economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, ELs, and students with disabilities.

- c. English Language Proficiency. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii)*)
  1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

English Language Progress to Proficiency Sub-Goals: By 2035,

- 70 percent of ELs will meet or exceed individual growth targets on ACCESS assessment annually.

To track EL progress toward the long term goal, South Carolina will establish a baseline growth rating using 2016 to 2017 results on the ACCESS assessment. Student performance in 2016 will be the point from which

<sup>3</sup> At this time, the 2017 graduation rate calculation has not been completed. This chart uses the 2016 graduation rate; however, the 2017 rate will be substituted in setting goals under an approved plan.

improvement toward the five-year proficiency target will be set. Progress results recorded from 2016 to 2017 will form the baseline for the English language proficiency (ELP) accountability long-term goal. Progress toward the ELP goal will be measured annually by increasing the percentage of students who meet or exceed the 2017 baseline. South Carolina has set an English proficiency target of 4.4 with no sub-domain below 4.0 within five years.

*Strategic interim target:* By 2026, reduce by 50 percent from the 2017 baseline the percentage of students not meeting annual growth.

- i. See Appendix D for ELP progress baselines and proficiency baselines.
  - ii. Timeline for meeting ELP goal:
 

2017	2016 to 2017 progress baseline set
2026	50 percent reduction in the distance between the baseline English progress rate and the state target English progress rate of 70 percent annually
  - iii. Ambitious target for annual English language progress to proficiency:  
 Currently, only 5 percent of schools show that 70 percent or more of the ELs meet their annual progress to proficiency targets in English. As a state, only 31 percent of ELs meet the annual progress to proficiency target. Analysis of empirical results show that students in South Carolina at initial lower proficiency levels (1.0–3.0) meet growth targets, but very few students at higher proficiency levels (4.0) progress to the proficiency target of 4.4 within the five year timeline set by the state.
2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A

**Example: English language progress – 70% of EL students will meet annual growth target.**

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement Target
<u>Progress</u>	31% ( <del>Actual</del> TBD)	70%	38	19 pts (50.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 37.4% Y6 Target (2023) = 43.8% Midpoint (2026) = 50.2%

- iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))

- a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

#### Background of Assessment for Achievement Metric

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure <i>-What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
<p><b>i. Academic Achievement</b></p> <p>Elementary Middle High District State</p>	<p>The achievement measure aggregates the number of students who score at Levels 1–4 on state summative assessments in ELA and mathematics for Grades 3–8 and Levels 1–5 on English 1 and Algebra 1 End-of-Course Examinations in grades 9–12.</p> <p><b>Note: A tiered point system will be used to meaningfully differentiate school performance in achievement. Reference Table 1 and Table 2 below</b></p>	<p>State summative assessments measure South Carolina college and career-ready standards as certified by all institutions of higher education in the state.</p> <p><b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability, research-based</u></b> –</p> <p>The state ensures that summative assessments measure the South Carolina college- and career-ready standards. Testing contractors and SCDE curriculum experts review and edit the items to ensure that each item is aligned to the state's standards and is developmentally appropriate for the grade level. A content review committee, consisting of South Carolina school and district staff with expertise in the content area and in the grade level for each set of items, compares the items with the standards to check for alignment and grade-level appropriateness. Items are edited or discarded as recommended. In addition, a bias review committee reviews the items to ensure each item does not contain anything that would result in bias or would be offensive to any segment of the population. The committee consists of members from a more general population (e.g., members of subgroups, social workers) and school or district staff whose jobs require knowledge of and sensitivity to subgroups (e.g., school counselors).</p> <p>South Carolina ensures content validity through the item development process used by the SCDE and its contractors. An independent alignment study of the 2017 test forms will be conducted by another state agency and will provide further evidence regarding content validity. The South Carolina Technical Advisory Committee has recommended a value of 0.85 as the minimally-acceptable degree of reliability for statewide tests. Preliminary analyses of test score reliability from the spring 2016 administration indicate internal consistency reliabilities that met or exceeded this recommendation for all grades and subjects.</p> <p>Scaling based in Item Response Theory (IRT) is used to place all items on a common scale or metric. Thus, although forms contain different items from year-to-year, the scaling process provides scores that are comparable.</p> <p>South Carolina follows the well-established and nationally recognized</p>



<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		<p>process of setting standards called <i>bookmarking</i>. In the <i>bookmarking</i> process, performance levels are based upon written descriptions of expectations of student achievement called Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs). For each program, initial draft PLDs are written by the contractor and SCDE staff. A committee of district and school staff who are experts in the subject matter at the appropriate grade level review and edit or rewrite the PLDs, as needed. For continuity, some of members of the PLD writing committee also serve on the standard setting committee.</p> <p>Standard setting committees consist of groups of school and district staff with expertise in the content area and grade level for the cut scores being recommended. The standard setting committee members are trained on the bookmarking process and then follow this process through three rounds of review (reviewing the booklets, placing a bookmark between two items to indicate a recommended cut score). Committee members are provided with impact data before the third and final round. Committees produce recommended cut scores for each subject and grade performance level. The contractor also computes standard errors for those recommendations. For testing programs that encompass multiple grade levels, a subset of each standard-setting committee reviews the recommended cut scores and makes adjustments for the purpose of vertical articulation (i.e., to improve consistency across grades). The SCDE staff makes adjustments within confidence intervals based upon the computed standard errors, when warranted, to improve consistency across the cut scores within grade and subject and across grades for each subject. Recommended cut scores are approved by the state superintendent and reported to the SBE.</p>
	<b><u>SC READY</u></b> <b>ELA and mathematics</b> <b>Gr 3–8</b>	<b><u>SC READY Performance Levels</u></b>  <p><b><i>Level 1: Does Not Meet Expectations:</i></b> The student <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> as defined by the grade level content standards. The student needs substantial academic support to be prepared for the next grade level and to be on track for college and career readiness.</p> <p><b><i>Level 2 – Approaches Expectations:</i></b> The student <i>Approaches Expectations</i> as defined by the grade level content standards. The student needs additional academic support to ensure success in the next grade level and to be on track for college and career readiness.</p> <p><b><i>Level 3 – Meets Expectations:</i></b> The student <i>Meets Expectations</i> as defined by the grade-level content standards. The student is prepared for the next grade level and is on track for college and career readiness.</p> <p><b><i>Level 4 – Exceeds Expectations:</i></b> The student <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> as defined by the grade level content standards. The student is well prepared for the next grade-level and is well prepared for college and career readiness.</p>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <b>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</b>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <b>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</b>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <b>-What are the measures used?</b> <b>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</b> <b>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</b>
	<u><b>SCPASS</b></u> <b>Science</b> <b>Gr 4, 6, 8</b> <b>Social Studies</b> <b>Gr 5 and 7</b> *Reported and calculated in the Preparing for Success (Student Success) Indicator	<u><b>SCPASS Performance Levels</b></u>  State law [ARTICLE 9, SECTION 59-18-900 (B)] specifies three levels (Not Met, Met, Exemplary). For accountability purposes, the EOC created the additional levels listed below and their descriptions for purpose of tracking growth:  <i><b>Level 1 – Not Met 1:</b></i> The student did not meet the grade-level standard.  <i><b>Level 2 – Not Met 2:</b></i> The student did not meet the grade-level standard, but was approaching expectations. <i>Note: For accountability, the EOC added this differentiated performance level to provide more detailed information for student performance approaching the grade-level target.</i>  <i><b>Level 3 – Met:</b></i> The student met the grade-level standard.  <i><b>Level 4 – Exemplary:</b></i> The student demonstrated exemplary performance in meeting the grade-level standards.  <i><b>Level 5 – Exemplary 5:</b></i> The student demonstrated exemplary performance in meeting the grade-level standards. <i>Note: For accountability, the EOC added this differentiated performance level to provide more detailed information regarding the highest exemplary performance on the grade-level standards.</i>
	<b>The aggregate number of high school students who score at Levels 1-5 on EOCEPs:</b> <b>English 1</b> <b>Algebra 1</b> <b>Biology 1</b> <b>U.S. History</b> <i>Note: Biology and U.S. History are reported and calculated in the Preparing for Success (Student Success) Indicator</i>	<u><b>EOCEP Performance Levels</b></u>  <b>The SCDE developed the names of the levels listed below and their descriptions. The levels correspond (as noted) to letter grades under the South Carolina Uniform Grading Policy (UGP).</b>  <i><b>Level 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations:</b></i> The student does not meet expectations of the course content standards (Letter Grade = F).  <i><b>Level 2 – Minimally Meets Expectations:</b></i> he student minimally meets expectations of the course standards (Letter Grade = D).  <i><b>Level 3 – Meets Expectations:</b></i> The student meets expectations of the course content standards (Letter Grades = B or C).  <i><b>Level 4 – Exceeds Expectations:</b></i> The student exceeds expectations of the course content standards (Letter Grade = A).

### **Accountability Calculation: Achievement Indicator**

- i. The Academic Achievement Indicator is aligned with South Carolina's long-term goals and uses a differentiated point system to move student achievement out of the bottom performance level (Level 1) where students have few opportunities for college and career success and into higher performance levels (Level 2) where students are approaching a level for some career opportunities, and into higher levels (Level 3 and Level 4) where students are demonstrating a trajectory for post-secondary college and career-readiness.
- ii. The achievement indicator measures the continuum of student proficiency on state summative assessments annually for all students and for all subgroups. The percentage of students at each performance level on state assessments will be reported annually for all students and for all subgroups, including the following: economically disadvantaged, non-economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, EL, students with disabilities, students without disabilities, males, females, migrant, military-connected, foster, and homeless. A weighted point index for Academic Achievement will be calculated for all students and all subgroups.
- iii. How Points Are Earned: An Achievement index rating will be generated by assigning points to each student's level score on the state summative tests, with greater points awarded for higher levels of proficiency. See Table 1 (Elementary/Middle) and Table 2 (High School). The students' points are aggregated across all ELA and math assessments, and the school's performance is measured as a percentage of the maximum points available across assessments and converting the ratio to an index.

**Table 1: Test Score to Points Conversion – SC READY and SC-ALT**

<b>Points</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>SC READY Level Descriptor</b>	<b>SC-ALT Level Descriptor</b>
0	Level 1	Does Not Meet	Emerging
1	Level 2	Approaches Expectations	Foundational
2	Level 3	Meets Expectations	Increasing
3	Level 4	Exceeds Expectations	Applied

### **Students included in elementary/middle rating:**

1. The assessment of students who were continuously enrolled is included. Students who are enrolled on the 45th day of the

school year and on the 160th day of the school year (testing must occur within the last 20 days of a 180 day school year) without being withdrawn from enrollment for more than five days during this time are included.

2. Student test scores in ELA and math are included.
3. Students who took alternate assessments are included in ratings.
4. Eligible non-native English speaking students were exempted from calculation. Note: ELs in their first two years in a U.S. school are assessed in all applicable tested subjects, but removed from the achievement metric (two years only).
5. Students who should have taken a subject area test, but did not, are assigned 0 points for that test and included in the denominator.
6. Students who take a high school end-of-course assessment in middle school will not be included in the academic achievement rating at the middle school for those assessments. Advanced students will take the South Carolina College-and Career-Ready Assessments (SC READY) and EOCEP. However, the school report card may include the end-of-course assessment results for middle school students who took an end-of-course assessment.

**Table 2: Test Score to Points Conversion EOCEPs (English 1 and Algebra 1)**

Points Earned	End-of-Course Grades
4	A
3	B
2	C
1	D
0	F

**Students included in the high school rating:**

1. The high school achievement metric will report results based on the 4-year graduation cohort.
2. Students with test scores on SC Alt ELA (High School), SC\_Alt Mathematics (High School), EOCEP Algebra 1 and English 1 from the South Carolina public schools.
3. Students who should have taken a South Carolina EOCEP, but did not are assigned 0 points for the missing test(s) and are included in the denominator.

**Achievement Indicator Points: Elementary and Middle**

Total Available Points:

With ELP: 35      \*Schools with an ELP indicator (EL n-size = 20)  
 Without ELP: 40      \*Schools that do not have an ELP indicator

Steps to calculate the Academic Achievement rating:

1. For each student/test combination, points are awarded using Table 1 (*see above*).
2. For each student/test combination, a maximum number of possible points are also assigned (3 for any SC READY test).

3. The sum of the points awarded is obtained by summing across students and tests.
4. The sum of the possible points is obtained by summing across students and tests.
5. The percentage of possible points earned is obtained by dividing the total obtained in (3) by the total obtained in (4).
6. The points on the 40-points scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 40, which is then rounded to the tenths place (e.g., 23.7).
7. The points on the 35-points scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 35, and rounding the result to the tenths place.

Below are the results of converting student assessment results into a school rating using the assessments administered in grades 3–8 in school year 2015–16. Based upon the 35-point scale, the mean or average points earned by an elementary or middle school was 15.3.


**Table 3: Achievement Scores on 35-point and 40-point Scales**

<b>Result</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Percent of possible points	43.8	13.1	9.4	94.5
Points on the 35-point scale	15.3	4.6	3.3	33.1
Points on the 40-point scale	17.5	5.2	3.8	37.8
<b>Elementary Schools (N=661)</b>				
Percent of possible points	45.1	12.8	11.5	83.2
Points on the 35-point scale	15.8	4.5	4.0	29.1
Points on the 40-point scale	18.0	5.1	4.6	33.3
<b>Middle Schools (N=314)</b>				
Percent of possible points	41.1	13.3	9.4	94.5
Points on the 35-point scale	14.4	4.6	3.3	33.1
Points on the 40-point scale	16.4	5.3	3.8	37.8


**Note:** All Schools (N=975) includes duplicate Elementary and Middle

The distribution of achievement scores on the 35-point and the 40-point scales are presented below. The distributions on these scales have the same shape; only the horizontal (x) axis values will change.

### Achievement Scores on the 35-point scale



### Achievement Scores on the 40-point scale.



### Achievement Indicator Points: High School

#### Total Available Points:

With ELP: 25                      \*Schools with an ELP indicator  
Without ELP: 30                   \*Schools without an ELP indicator

#### Steps to calculate Academic Achievement Rating:

1. For each student/test combination, points are awarded using Table 2 listed above.
2. For each student/test combination, a maximum number of 4 possible points is assigned.
3. The sum of the points awarded is obtained by summing across students and tests.
4. The sum of the possible points is obtained by summing across students and tests.
5. The percentage of possible points earned is obtained by dividing the total obtained in (3) by the total obtained in (4).

6. The points on the 25-point scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 25 and rounding to the tenths place (e.g. 23.7).
7. The points on the 30-point scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 30 and rounding the results to the tenths place.

**Table 4: High School Summary Statistics on 100 point scale and transformed to 25 and 30 point scales**

EOCEP Score Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	All High Schools (N=232)			
Percent of Total Points	45.8	14.0	13.2	97.7
25 Point	11.4	3.5	3.3	24.4
30 Point	13.7	4.2	4.0	29.3

**Achievement Indicator Summative Rating: Elementary/Middle**  
 Achievement Summative Ratings will be reported in five categories: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

Ratings were developed two ways as follows:

1. With a common range of scores for elementary and middle schools, and
2. With ranges of scores unique to elementary and middle schools.

Because both the school scores on the 35-point scale and the cut-points that separate each rating category on the 35-point scale can be obtained from the corresponding values on the 40-point scale by multiplying using the same ratio (35/40), schools will have the same rating regardless of whether their score is expressed on the 35-point or the 40-point scale.

The target percentage is based upon two factors:

1. The percentage of schools by absolute rating from 2002 to 2006. This time period of the state accountability system had the most consistent ratings; and
2. The ESSA requirement that at a minimum, the bottom 5 percent of schools be identified for intervention.

**Table 5: Ratings using separate ranges of scores for elementary schools.**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores*		Percent of Schools
		35-point	40-point	
Excellent	<b>10</b>	21.65 – 35.00	24.74 – 40.00	10.1
Good	<b>15</b>	18.70 – 21.64	21.37 – 24.73	15.1
Average	<b>40</b>	13.88 – 18.69	15.86 – 21.36	39.8
Below Average	<b>25</b>	10.18 – 13.87	11.63 – 15.85	25.0
Unsatisfactory	<b>10</b>	0.00 – 10.17	0.00 – 11.62	10.0

**Table 6: Ratings Using Separate Ranges of Scores for Middle Schools.**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores*		Percent of Schools
		35-point	40-point	
Excellent	10	20.20 – 35.00	23.09 – 40.00	10.2
Good	15	16.84 – 20.19	19.25 – 23.08	14.6
Average	40	12.36 – 16.83	14.12 – 19.24	40.5
Below Average	25	8.57 – 12.35	9.79 – 14.11	24.8
Unsatisfactory	10	0.00 – 8.56	0.00 – 9.78	9.9

**Table 7: Summary Ratings for Elementary and Middle Schools with Ranges of Scores Unique to School Type.**

Rating	Target %	School Type*		All Schools
		Elementary	Middle	
Excellent	10	10.1	10.2	10.2
Good	15	15.1	14.6	15.0
Average	40	39.8	40.5	40.0
Below Average	25	25.0	24.8	24.9
Unsatisfactory	10	10.0	9.9	9.9

*Note:* For accountability purposes, South Carolina will use ranges of scores unique to an elementary school and to a middle school and the target percentages for ratings as defined above in Table 7.

#### **Achievement Indicator Summative Rating: High School**

Achievement Summative Ratings will be reported in five categories: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.



**Table 8: Ranges of Scores and Percent of High Schools Receiving Each Rating.**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores*		Percent of Schools
		25-point	30-point	
Excellent	10	15.38 – 25.00	18.45 – 30.00	10.3
Good	15	13.36 – 15.37	16.03 – 18.44	14.7
Average	40	10.09 – 13.35	12.11 – 16.02	40.1
Below Average	25	7.41 – 10.08	8.89 – 12.10	25.0
Unsatisfactory	10	0.00 – 7.40	0.00 – 8.88	9.9

*Note:* If a school tests less than 95 percent of eligible students, then the school cannot receive the highest rating in Achievement and instead will be reduced by one rating level. Also, schools that persistently test less than 95 percent of eligible students must submit a plan to the SCDE outlining how the school will increase the percentage of students tested.

Below is the High School Achievement on the 25-point scale and on the 30-point scale. On the 30-point scale, the scores range from 4.0 to 29.3 with a mean of 13.7, which is only slightly below the half-way point. There is no skewness that would indicate that schools will be advantaged or disadvantaged using this measure.





- b. Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

## Academic Progress/Growth

### Description

South Carolina will include a measure of Academic Progress/Growth for grades 3–8 in ELA and mathematics. Annually schools receive a value-added growth measure (measure of student progress) during the reported year. Currently the measure is received from the SAS Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) (future value-added services will be the subject of a new procurement). The growth measure describes the amount of progress made by a group of students from one point in time to the next. The growth measure is reported in scale scores, depending on the test. At the school level, the growth measure is a measure of progress relative to the growth of students in the average school in the state, called the growth standard. A positive growth measure indicates that students grew more than the average school statewide. A negative growth measures indicates that students did not grow as much as the average school statewide.

The growth measure is reported with its standard error, which describes the uncertainty around the growth measure and can be used as a measure of the evidence that the growth measure is significantly different from the growth standard.

The subgroups reported will be economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, EL, and students with disabilities. **The growth measure will be reported for subgroups of 20 students.**

### Background on Value-Added Growth Measures

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure <i>-What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
Academic Progress  Elementary Middle District State	The growth metric will measure growth annually in ELA and mathematics on <b>SC READY</b> in grades 4–8.  <b>Note:</b> A value-added model will be used to document growth differences between schools and between high- and low-achieving students to meaningfully differentiate school performance.	For the first time in accountability, South Carolina will use a value-added system to measure growth. Currently the value-added measures use EVAAS methodology initially formulated by William Sanders and further developed by Sanders and colleagues at SAS Institute, Inc. These procedures, while computationally complex, have a substantial body of empirical testing in research literature to support them. Value-added modeling is a statistical analysis used to measure the academic growth rates of groups of students from year-to-year using the Multivariate Response Model (MRM) to measure overall school growth and growth of the lowest 20 percent of students. MRM is an analysis for tests that are given in consecutive years. MRM measures growth between two points in time for a group of students. MRM answers the question: Did a group of students maintain the same relative position with respect to statewide student achievement from one year to the next for a specific subject and grade?  The expectation of progress is based upon how the individual students within the group performed, on average, compared to other students just like them across the state. A value-added model then compares the

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure  <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>										
		group’s actual progress to the expectation of progress and uses statistical measures to determine whether there is evidence that the group made more than, less than, or about the same progress as expected.										
	<b>50 percent of the growth points will be awarded for the progress of All Students and 50 percent will be awarded for the progress of the bottom quintile.</b>	Half of the growth points in the accountability model will come from growth demonstrated in mathematics and ELA in grades 4–8 for All Students. The other half of growth points in the accountability model will come from growth demonstrated by the bottom quintile. Currently, South Carolina students scoring in the bottom quintile are significantly behind their grade level peers and are not on a trajectory for college/career readiness. The growth model will incentivize growth for the lowest performing students.										
		<b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability research-based</u></b> – The only assessments administered in consecutive years are the SC READY assessments in ELA and mathematics. Student progress at the school level and for the lowest performing 20 percent of students will measure only student growth in ELA and mathematics.  All students are included in the analyses if they have scores that can be used. There must be at least six students who are associated with the school in subject/grade/year. The association could mean they were tested at the school or at the district level.  For school year 2017–18, schools also receive predicted growth measures for subject areas that are not assessed in consecutive years, i.e. science and social studies, using Univariate Response Model (URM). URM, an analysis for tests that are not given for consecutive years, is a regression-based model that measures the difference between students’ predicted scores for a particular subject/year with their observed scores. The growth expectation is met when students in a school made the same amount of progress as students in the average school for that same year/subject/grade. For 2017–18, the predicted growth measures will be provided to schools but not reported on the school report card.										
	<b>South Carolina used historical ratings in growth to determine initial targets for meaningful differentiation.</b>	<p>The EOC was a key stakeholder in developing South Carolina’s growth metric. The EOC staff analyzed school value table growth ratings from South Carolina’s report cards from 2002–14. The following table documents the percentage of schools identified by specific growth rankings across the years. The distribution is not consistent across years or even spans of time.</p> <p>Based upon the historical progress data below, the EOC recommended South Carolina use similar target percentages for the new accountability model.</p> <p><b>SC Historical Growth Ratings in State Accountability</b></p> <table><tr><th>Rating</th><th>% of Schools</th></tr><tr><td>Excellent</td><td>10.93%</td></tr><tr><td>Good</td><td>18.15%</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>27.24%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Average</td><td>20.76%</td></tr></table>	Rating	% of Schools	Excellent	10.93%	Good	18.15%	Average	27.24%	Below Average	20.76%
Rating	% of Schools											
Excellent	10.93%											
Good	18.15%											
Average	27.24%											
Below Average	20.76%											

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied?</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure <i>-What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>			
			Unsatisfactory/At-Risk	22.92%	

**Students included in the Rating:**

1. The assessment of students who were continuously enrolled are included. Students who are enrolled on the 45th day of the school year and on the 160th day of the school year without being withdrawn from enrollment for more than five days during this time are included.
2. Students in the school who have ELA and mathematics scores from the prior year to measure change in performance between two points in time.
3. Students with alternate assessment scores in ELA and mathematics from the prior year to measure change in performance between two points in time.
4. Eligible non-native English speaking students were exempted from calculation. Note: ELs will not count in growth in year one but will count in year two.
5. ~~Students who should have taken a subject area test, but did not, are assigned 0 points for that test and included in the denominator.~~

**Academic Progress/Growth Indicator Points: Elementary/Middle**

Points	Schools Receiving These Academic Progress Growth Points:
35	Schools that have an ELP Indicator (n = 20)
40	Schools that do not have an ELP Indicator (n < 20)

**How Points Are Earned:** South Carolina will use a point system that awards points for variations in the growth achieved in ELA and mathematics in elementary schools and middle schools independently. A growth index will be reported for all students and for all required accountability subgroups. For accountability calculations:

- 50 percent of the growth points will come from the growth **index** of ALL students in the school
- 50 percent of the growth points will come from the growth **index** of the lowest quintile of students in the school.

A key decision point for South Carolina was how to define the bottom quintile. South Carolina explored two options: 1) use the bottom quintile in the state or 2) use the bottom quintile in the school. Based on the following analysis, the EOC staff recommended using a growth index that measures student progress of the bottom 20 percent at each school in ELA and mathematics only. The SCDE supported this recommendation as the results for each method were very consistent; it ensured that all schools in South Carolina were included in the lowest quintile measure, and it reinforced growth for the lowest achieving students in each school's unique setting (See Table 9 and Table 10 below for a comparison of lowest quintile in the state and lowest quintile in the

school).

**Table 9: Summary Statistics of Growth Indices by Year and School Type (Lowest Quintile (20%))**

Growth Index	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
<b>2015 – Elementary</b>					
All Students	638	-0.03	3.35	-19.82	9.91
Low 20 – School	642	0.74	1.98	-7.72	7.12
Low 20 – State	636	0.73	2.01	-8.36	7.89
<b>2015 – Middle</b>					
All Students	306	-0.29	4.55	-19.82	11.88
Low 20 – School	312	0.77	2.61	-7.72	8.40
Low 20 – State	307	0.70	2.66	-8.36	8.40
<b>2016 – Elementary</b>					
All Students	638	-0.05	3.26	-13.46	11.61
Low 20 – School	643	-0.26	2.04	-8.63	6.74
Low 20 – State	636	-0.49	2.07	-12.74	5.71
<b>2016 – Middle</b>					
All Students	306	-0.16	4.86	-13.46	17.43
Low 20 – School	316	-1.10	2.79	-11.53	5.70
Low 20 – State	311	-1.42	2.91	-12.74	6.80

**Table 10: Correlations among Growth Indices by Year and School Type**

Year	School Type	All Students Growth w/Low 20% School	All Students Growth w/Low 20% State	Low 20% School w/Low 20% State
2015	Elementary	.82	.79	.91
2015	Middle	.80	.78	.94
2016	Elementary	.83	.78	.90
2016	Middle	.85	.80	.93

Steps to calculate the Academic Progress/Growth rating:

1. Create progress scores based on all students on a 35 ~~40~~ point scale by adding 17.5 points to the original growth index for all students.
2. Create progress scores based on the lowest 20 percent of students in each school on a 35 point scale by adding 17.5 points to the original growth index for the lowest performing 20 percent.
3. Average these combined progress scores to obtain each school progress score on a 35 point scale.
4. Multiply these progress scores by 40/35 to obtain progress scores on a 40 point scale

Steps to calculate the Academic Progress/Growth rating:

1. Average the growth indices from (a) all students and (b) the lowest 20% based on student's average achievement scores from the current year and the previous year.
2. Truncate the score by changing scores above 6.0 to 6.0 and scores below -6.0 to -6.0.
3. Translate the truncated score to the 0 to 40 scale by
  - a. Multiplying by 20/6
  - b. Adding 20

**Table 11: Summary Statistics for Progress Indices of All Students and Lowest Quintile (20%) in the School**

Simple Statistics						
Growth Index Score	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
All Students	638	-0.054	3.26	-13.46	11.61	25.07
Lowest 20 Percent	643	-0.259	2.04	-8.63	6.74	15.17
<b>Group Progress Score (35-point scale)</b>						
All Students	638	17.446	3.26	4.04	29.11	25.07
Lowest 20 Percent	643	17.241	2.04	8.86	24.24	15.17
<b>School Progress Score (Mean of All Students and Lowest 20 Percent)</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>17.322</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>8.63</b>	<b>26.58</b>	<b>17.95</b>

**Table 11: Impact of Truncation of Averaged Indices on School Progress Indicator**

School Year	Number of Scores Truncated	Percentage of Scores Truncated
2015 (lower than -6)	16	1.67
2015 (greater than 6)	21	2.2
2016 (lower than -6)	29	3.01
2016 (greater than 6)	17	1.76

**Summary of Statistics:**

1. By adding 17.5 points to each growth index, the lowest group progress score is 4.04 and the highest is 29.11, which nearly covers the range from 0 to 35. By not adjusting these scores in any other way, the possibility that progress scores less than 0 or greater than 35 at some time in the future can be minimized. Should these scores occur, they can simply be assigned the minimum (0) or the maximum (35) value.
2. The mean of the school progress scores is 17.322.
3. The school progress scores range from 8.63 to 26.58. This is not quite as large a range as for the All Students score, but means are always less variable than the individual scores.

**Discussion of Method:**

The average of the school growth indices for all students and the lowest 20% are normally distributed and the standard deviation is 2.54. This resulted in ~68% of the school ratings falling within 6 points on a 40-point scale. Truncating the average indices between -6 and 6 allowed the scale to be transformed to utilize more of the available scale. The relative rating changes between the achievement scale and the academic progress scale to have similar impacts on the overall rating for the school.

**Academic Progress/Growth Summative Rating:(Elementary/Middle)**

Progress Summative Ratings will be reported on five levels: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

Below are the ranges of scores that define each rating, where the target percent of each rating are: Unsatisfactory (10 percent), Below

**Average (20 percent), Average (35 percent), Good (20 percent), and Excellent (15 percent).** Also included are the ranges of the observed scores for schools by rating, both in the original value-added growth index scale and on the 35-point scale created by adding 17.5 points to the original value-added growth index scale.

The observed score ranges for adjacent ratings overlap. For example, for the all students group progress score scale, the lowest observed value for schools with an excellent rating is 19.04, which is below the cut-off for a rating of excellent (19.819). Similarly, the highest observed score for the all students group progress score for schools with a good rating is 21.16, which is above the cut-off for excellent. When averaging the group progress scores from all students with the group progress score from the lowest 20 percent of students, each score may be in the range associated with different ratings, but the average (the school progress score) can only be associated with one rating. The ranges of school progress scores that define each rating only apply to the average of the all students and lowest 20 percent scores. They may serve as guidelines for the group progress measures, but cannot be interpreted strictly for these measures.

To compute a growth index for a school group, there must be at least 6 students in a grade level and subject with scores in the current and previous year. The minimum grade level sample size necessary to compute a lowest 20 percent sub score, then, is 30 students with scores in the current and previous year. If there are fewer than 30 students in at least one grade level with scores in the current and previous year, the school progress rating will be the rating based exclusively on the all students group progress score.

The Value-Add methodology is not appropriate when applied to groups smaller than 6. Groups in a subject/grade smaller than 30 would result in the use of a group of less than 6 to calculate the lowest 20% in that grade/subject measure. When a subject/grade group is smaller than 30 the all students growth index will replace the average of the all students growth index and the lowest 20% growth index.

Tables 12–14 below indicate the differentiation among elementary and middle schools respectively.

**Table 12: Ranges of Scores that Define Each Rating and Observed Scores Associated with each rating for Elementary Schools.**

Rating	Range of Scores (35-Point Scale)	Range of Observed Scores Value-Added Progress Indices		Range of Observed Scores Group Progress Score	
		All Students	Lowest 20%	All Students	Lowest 20%
Excellent	19.819–35.00	1.54–11.61	0.52–6.74	19.04–29.11	18.02–24.24
Good	18.193–19.818	–0.1–4.66	–1.07–2.75	17.4–22.16	16.43–20.25
Average	16.016–18.192	–3.02–2.72	–2.49–1.9	14.48–20.22	15.01–19.4
Below Average	14.331–16.015	–5.01–0.4	–3.41–1.07	12.49–17.1	14.09–18.57
Unsatisfactory	0.00–14.330	–13.46–2.86	–8.63–0.05	4.04–14.64	8.87–17.45

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Range of Scores (40-Point Scale)</b>
Excellent	29.02 – 40.00
Good	23.97 – 29.01
Average	16.35 – 23.96
Below Average	9.78 – 16.34
Unsatisfactory	0.00 – 9.77

**Table 13: Ranges of Scores that Define Each Rating and Observed Scores Associated with each rating for Middle Schools.**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Range of Scores (35-Point Scale)</b>	<b>Range of Observed Scores Value-Added Progress Indices</b>		<b>Range of Observed Scores Group Progress</b>	
		<b>All Students</b>	<b>Lowest 20%</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>Lowest 20%</b>
Excellent	20.483 – 35.000	3.56 – 17.43	0.3 – 5.7	21.06 – 34.93	17.80 – 23.20
Good	18.301 – 20.482	0.93 – 7.38	-1.74 – 3.39	18.43 – 24.88	15.76 – 20.89
Average	15.113 – 18.300	-3.43 – 3.72	-4.48 – 1.10	14.07 – 21.22	13.02 – 18.60
Below Average	12.282 – 15.112	-6.58 – 1.44	-6.69 – 0.82	10.92 – 16.06	10.81 – 16.68
Unsatisfactory	0.00 – 12.281	-13.46 – 5.12	-11.53 – 2.4	4.04 – 12.38	5.97 – 15.10


<b>Rating</b>	<b>Range of Scores (40-Point Scale)</b>
Excellent	31.50 – 40.00
Good	24.39 – 31.49
Average	14.53 – 24.38
Below Average	4.43 – 14.52
Unsatisfactory	0.00 – 4.42

Using these criteria, the number and percentage of schools that would have received each rating in the **pooled 2015 2016 sample** are presented below in Table 14. Because the range of scores that define each Progress Rating are different for Elementary and Middle schools, the percentage of schools that receive each rating are similar by school type, and are very near the target percentages.

**Table 14: The Number and Percentage of Schools that Would Receive Each Rating (Pooled 2015 2016 Data)**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>School Type (Pooled 2015 2016)</b>		
	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>All Schools</b>
Excellent	184 14.24	86 13.67	147 15.2
Good	226 17.49	112 17.81	192 19.90
Average	480 37.15	231 36.72	338 35.03
Below Average	287 22.21	136 21.62	193 20.00
Unsatisfactory	115 8.90	64 10.17	95 9.84
<b>Total</b>	<b>1292</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>965</b>





- c. **Graduation Rate.** Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

**Graduation Rate Indicator:**

- i. South Carolina has set a long range graduation target of 90 percent of students graduating in four years. Accordingly, the graduation rate accountability metric outlines “Excellent” performance at 90 percent or higher graduating in four years and “Unsatisfactory” performance at 70 percent or fewer graduating in four years.
- ii. Each high school’s graduation rate is reported annually and compared to the state’s long-term graduation rate goal of 90 percent for all students and subgroups, including: economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, EL, students with disabilities, foster, and homeless. South Carolina offers one high school diploma that has the same requirements for ALL students. Beginning with the freshman class of 2019, students will be able to select personalized pathways to

complete the 24 graduation credits; however, the credits required to reach graduation will remain the same.

- iii. The 4-year graduation rate cohort model will be the only metric that receives points in the accountability metric.
- iv. In the past, the state has used both a 4-year and 5-year graduation rates for accountability. However, there was not enough of a statistical difference between the two graduation rates to pursue it in 2018.

#### Background for Graduation Rate:

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure <i>-What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
ii. Graduation Rate  High District State	<p>The <u>graduation rate</u> measures the aggregate percentage of students who graduate within four years based upon a four-year adjusted cohort methodology.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> A point system will be used to award points for the percentage of students graduating in four years to meaningfully differentiate school performance. See Section C below.</p>	<p>Graduation rates are calculated based on the number of students who earned a regular high school diploma divided by the total number of students in the cohort. A student is initially added to the four year graduation cohort if the student is present on the 45th day of his first year in high school. A NineGR marker is established in the statewide student information system using the spring semester date of the student's first year of high school enrollment.</p> <p><b>The following rules apply to the cohort:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Students may be removed from the cohort for the following reasons: student death, emigration, and properly documented transfer.</li> <li>(2) Students may be added to the cohort when they transfer into a high school from in-state or out of state institutions.</li> <li>(3) Currently students who meet the state diploma requirements as a result of attending summer school following their senior year will count in the calculation of the on-time graduation rate.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability, research-based –</u></b> The graduation methodology follows USED guidelines to determine the graduation cohort. This method is applied uniformly across the state and has produced reliable results for reporting both the four year and five year graduation rates for the last eight years.</p>

#### Graduation Rate Points: (High School)

Points Available	For Which High Schools:
25	Schools that have an ELP indicator ( $n \geq 20$ )
30	Schools that do not have an ELP indicator ( $n < 20$ )

South Carolina will measure the percentage of students who graduate in four years using the four-year adjusted cohort model and will report result by all students and federally required subgroups.

**How Points Earned:** Points are earned based on converting the four-year graduation rate from the cohort for the current year onto either a 25- or a 30-point scale. A school with a 100 percent on-time graduation rate earns all 25 or 30 points.

To meaningfully differentiate school performance and incentivize improvement towards the state long-range graduation rate goal, South Carolina will set initial cut points for “Excellent” and for “Unsatisfactory” based on the following:

1. The state goal for on-time graduation rates is 90 percent or higher.
2. ESSA requires states to intervene in high schools graduating 67 percent or less of students.

Students included in the rating:

1. Students whose initial enrollment as a 9th grade student was three years prior to the current year **unless the student meets one of the approved reasons for removal from the cohort (documentation of transfer to another diploma-granting high school, emigration to another country, transfer to prison or juvenile facility, or death)**.
2. ~~Students who withdraw from high school without earning a diploma and without transferring to another educational program that grants a regular high school diploma during such school year will no longer be counted in the graduation rate. ESSA § 1111(c)(4).~~

Steps in Creating Academic Graduation Rating:

1. Obtain the graduation rate for the current cohort based on all students.
2. To obtain the graduation rate on the 30-point scale, multiply the graduation rate in step (1) by 30/100.
3. To obtain the graduation rate on the 25-point scale, multiply the graduation rate in step (1) by 25/100.

Full-Scale Graduation Rates:

1. To obtain a graduation rate that uses as much of a 25-point scale as possible, use the following formula:  $(\text{Graduation Rate} - 50)/2$ .
2. To obtain a graduation rate that uses as much of a 30-point scale as possible, multiply the full-scale graduation rate in step (4) by 30/25.
3. The number represents the percentage of points earned in the category.
4. Multiply the number by the weight of the category divided by 100.

Table 15 below presents summary statistics of the original graduation rate which is expressed on a 100-point scale. The graduation rates transformed to both a 25 point and 35-point scale are also presented below.

**Table 15: Graduation Rate 100 Point Scale, 25 Point Scale and 30 Point Scale (with full scale conversions)**

Graduation Rate Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	All High Schools (N=222)			
Common Grad Rate – 100 points	83.4	11.6	19.1	100
Common Grad Rate – 25 Point	20.8	2.9	4.8	25
Common Grad Rate – 30 Point	25.0	3.5	5.7	30

Graduation Rate Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	All High Schools (N=222)			
Full Scale – 25 Points	16.9	4.9	0	25
Full Scale – 30 Points	20.3	5.8	0	30

**Graduation Rate Summative Rating:**

The graduation rate summative rating will be reported on five levels: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

The ranges of scores that are included for each rating were developed using the following criteria:


1. Schools with a graduation rate of 90 percent or higher, which is the target state goal of the ESSA state plan, as well as an EOC recommended goal for the state.
2. The rounded state average graduation rate (83 percent) will be in the middle of the range of average ratings.
3. Schools with a graduation rate below 70 percent will receive an Unsatisfactory rating.

Table 16 below presents an abbreviated table of graduation rates with the cumulative percentage of schools at or below each graduation rate for the highest and lowest graduation percentages associated with each rating.

Note: The target percentage for the Excellent rating is 25 percent because 25 percent of schools have a graduation rate of 90 percent or greater. Similarly, the target percentage is five percent for the Unsatisfactory rating because five percent of schools have a graduation rate of less than 70 percent. The percentages for the remaining categories may be changed.

**Table 16: Ranges of Scores and Percent of Schools receiving each rating.**

Rating	Target Percentage	Range of Scores*		Percent of Schools
		Full Scale 25-point	Full Scale 30-point	
Excellent Grad Rate>90%	25	20.00 – 25.00	24.00 – 30.00	25.2
Good	30	16.89 – 19.97	20.27 23.97	30.2
Average	25	14.04 – 16.88	16.85 20.26	24.8
Below Average	15	10.01 – 14.03	12.1 – 16.84	14.4
Unsatisfactory (Grad Rate<70%)	5	0 – 10.00	0 – 12.00	5.4



- d. **Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)**  
**Indicator** Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State’s definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

**English Language Proficiency Definition**

South Carolina is a member of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortia and uses the ELP assessment. The state’s definition of English proficiency on ACCESS is a 4.4 – Bridging composite score with no sub-score below 4.0 in reading, writing, speaking, or listening. The whole number in the composite score indicates the student’s language proficiency level based upon the WIDA English Language Development Standards. The decimal indicates the proportion within the proficiency level range that the student’s scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. Research indicates that cognitive academic language proficiency in English typically develops over a five-to-seven-year period. Factors affecting this timeline include time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education.

To account for these variables, South Carolina will monitor the attainment of English proficiency by awarding points in the accountability metrics for the percentage of EL students who score a composite 4.4 within five years after initial identification on the WIDA screener. If the student is identified at level 4.0 on the WIDA Screener, the student will then have four years to achieve a composite of 4.4 after initial identification. This allows students to have expected growth targets towards proficiency every year.

### **English Growth/Progress Definition**

WIDA draws on multiple theories and approaches in an effort to describe language use in academic contexts. South Carolina has produced a set of Growth Expectations for students dependent on the student's initial proficiency and grade level for the grade spans offered by WIDA assessment. The student's initial score on the WIDA Screener sets the baseline score from which a trajectory or set of trajectories is computed using the student as his or her own baseline.

The baseline score for entry at Level 1 or Level 2 sets a linear trajectory to the value of 3.8 in Year 3. The linear trajectory of Years four and five is simply half the distance between 3.8 or the student's score at Year 3, whichever performance level is higher (or slope lower). The baseline score for entry at Level 3 or Level 4 sets a linear trajectory from the student's entry score to 4.4 over five years for entry at Level 3 or four years for entry at Level 4. At the end of each year, the growth expectation is determined as the y value of the line rounded to the nearest tenth. If the student's score annually meets or exceeds that expected value, the student has achieved the expected growth for the year. South Carolina will monitor the percentage of all EL students who achieve expected growth annually through the long range goals and interim targets and through the ELP growth points in the accountability metrics.

### **Background on the ACCESS Assessment**

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
<b>i. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency</b>	<b>The ELP measure will document aggregate annual growth in English for EL and proficiency in English within a prescribed period based on the EL student's initial proficiency level.</b>	<b><u>Identification of EL</u></b> South Carolina administers the (WIDA ACCESS for ELs and the Alternate ACCESS for ELs as its ELP test. All students in South Carolina complete a Home Language Survey (HLS) upon enrollment. <b><u>Questions include the following:</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What is the primary language used in the home regardless of the language spoken by the student?</li><li>2. What is the language spoken by the student?</li><li>3. What is the language that the student first acquired?</li><li>4. In what language would you prefer to get information from the school?</li></ol>
		<b><u>Students Counted in the English Language Proficiency Metric:</u></b> A language screener is administered to students who answer one of three questions on the survey with a response other than "English". WIDA provides an aligned language screener that measures four domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) for students in grades 1–12. A composite score below 4.4 identifies a student as "EL" and qualifies the student for English language services and ACCESS testing. The WIDA screening tool for kindergarten includes two domains (speaking and listening). Students in kindergarten who score 26 or below are identified as an EL and qualify for EL services and ACCESS testing. Kindergarten students who score 28 or above are

Accountability Indicator <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	Accountability Measure <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure <i>-What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		coded as bilingual and are not served as and EL student in the EL program. However, these kindergarten students are monitored for two years to ensure they do not need EL services.
Elementary Middle High District State	100% of points will be awarded for the percentage of ELs who meet annual growth targets towards English proficiency within five years	<b><u>English Language Proficiency- ACCESS Assessment:</u></b> The ACCESS language assessment measures overall language proficiency from kindergarten through grade 12 on six levels: Level 1 – Entering, Level 2 – Emerging, Level 3 – Developing, Level 4 – Expanding, Level 5 – Bridging, and Level 6 – Reaching. The composite performance level is derived from a weighted average: 15 percent listening, 15 percent speaking, 35 percent reading, and 35 percent writing. A composite score of 4.4 (Bridging) is required for a student to be proficient in English, as long as the student has scored no lower than 4.0 on any sub-domain. Access 2.0 is given in the spring and is required for all ELs beginning in the first year of attendance in any U.S. schools. Kindergarten results on the ACCESS 2.0 will serve as a baseline in the growth metric for accountability. All ELs must continue taking the ACCESS assessment until they achieve the state-prescribed minimum score to be considered proficient in English
		<b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability, research-based –</u></b> The ACCESS assessment was tested to confirm the reliability of the vertical scale. ACCESS is used to monitor the percentage of all ELs who achieve expected growth annually through the long range goals and interim targets and through the ELP growth points in the accountability metrics. Note: Elementary students who reach proficiency (4.4 composite) will have met the annual growth for that year.
		Factors affecting proficiency include time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education. To account for these variables, South Carolina will monitor the attainment of English proficiency by awarding points in the accountability metrics for the percentage of ELs who score a composite 4.4 within five years after initial identification or four years after initial identification at Level 4.0. Additional evidence of the validity and reliability of ACCESS 2.0 is provided in Chapter 2 (pages 28–44) of the WIDA “Series 303 ACCESS Annual Technical Report” posted at <a href="https://www.wida.us/downloadLibrary.aspx">https://www.wida.us/downloadLibrary.aspx</a> .

#### Background on the South Carolina ELP Growth Targets

Growth baselines are calculated based on proficiency level change by proficiency level entry. Based on research by Cook, Boals, Wilmes, and Santos (2008), we expect faster language acquisition at lower levels and slower acquisition as the levels increase (as defined on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment). All levels were placed on a similar scale using ACCESS 1.0 data from 2014–15 using the concordance table for Composite Proficiency Levels produced by the WIDA consortium. The levels have properties like those seen in ACCESS 2.0. ACCESS 2015–16 scores (rescaled by the WIDA consortium to match ACCESS 2.0), and our

ACCESS 2.0 2016–17 assessment data provided the three years of similar scores. From these transformations, South Carolina was able to derive a growth trajectory or set of growth trajectories for students based on their entry level.

To ensure ambitious goals, South Carolina computed empirical level changes by performance level. At every Screener Level, the growth expectation was higher by year two of receiving EL services.

**Table 17: Growth Expectations by Year Based on Incoming Composite Proficiency Level Floor**

Screener Level	Empirical Level Change	Years One through Three Level Change Goals	Years Four or Four and Five Level Change Goals
1	1.3	0.9 (x3 = 2.8)	0.3 (x2 = 0.6)
2	0.5	0.6 (x3 = 1.8)	0.3 (x2 = 0.6)
3	0.3	0.3 (x3 = 0.8) <sup>†</sup>	0.3 (x2 = 0.6)
4*	0.0	0.1 (x3 = 0.3)	0.1

\* Level 4 entry only allows for four years of growth.

<sup>†</sup> Result is due to rounding.

**Table 18: Growth Expectation Formula by Year and Entry Performance Level**


Screener Level	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5
1	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3)	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3*2)	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3*3)	Round(3.8 <sup>†</sup> + (4.4-3.8 <sup>†</sup> )/2)	4.4
2	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3)	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3*2)	Round(SL+ (3.8-SL)/3*3)	Round(3.8 <sup>†</sup> + (4.4-3.8 <sup>†</sup> )/2)	4.4
3	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/5)	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/5*2)	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/5*3)	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/5*4)	4.4
4	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/4)	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/4*2)	Round(SL+ (4.4-SL)/4*3)	4.4	

<sup>†</sup> These values are to be set at 3.8 or Y3 performance level, whichever is higher.

Cook, H.G., Boals, T., Wilmes, C., & Santos, M. (2008). Issues in the development of annual measurable achievement objectives for WIDA consortium states (WCER Working Paper No. 2008-2). Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved July 20, 2017 from <http://wcer.wisc.edu/publications/year/2008>.



**Table 19: Growth Trajectories by Screener Level Including Current Observed Growth Trajectories from Minimum Value of Screener Level.**



### English Language Proficiency Points

Total Available Points: 10 points

### Percent of Schools with ELP Rating ( $n \geq 20$ )

School Type	Percent with ELP Rating
Elementary	41.6
Middle	45.5
High	44.4

How Points Are Earned: Points will be earned for the percentage of ELs meeting expected growth targets on ACCESS 2.0 using the progress to proficiency (Table 19) identified above.

### Students Included in the Rating:

1. Elementary, Middle, and High Schools: Includes students who have an initial ACCESS scores and a score in the reporting year.
2. Middle and High Schools
  - a. Includes students who initially received EL services 5 years prior if the initial WIDA screener indicated a comparable ACCESS composite score of 3.9 or lower, or
  - b. Includes students who initially received EL services 4 years prior if the initial WIDA screener indicated a comparable ACCESS composite score of 4.0 or higher.

### Steps to Create English Progress Rating

EL students demonstrating one year's academic progress in attaining English is determined by the following steps:

1. Find students with the following matched scores: an ACCESS Composite score in the initial year and a score in the reporting year and the student's initial date of entry into US schools.
2. Find the growth target based on the formula appropriate to the Screener Level and years in country.
3. Find the number of students with scores that meet or exceed their growth target.
4. Divide the number of students in (3) by the number of students in (1).
5. Multiply number by the weight of the category.

### English Language Proficiency Summative Rating

The ELP summative rating will be reported on five levels: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

**Table 20: ELP Summative Rating Targets for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools**

Rating	% Students Meeting ELP Proficiency Target	% Schools		
		Elementary	Middle	High
Excellent	80 to 100%	66.4	4.0	8.8
Good	70 to 79%	24.2	18.4	29.7
Average	60 to 69%	7.4	29.6	35.2
Below Average	50 to 59%	1.6	23.2	15.4
Unsatisfactory	Less than 50%	0.4	24.8	11.0

- e. **School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s).** Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

South Carolina will include a Student Success and School Quality Indicator in the accountability model. These indicators will be reported for all students and all subgroups annually. The subgroups reported will be economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, EL, and students with disabilities (iii).

The State Superintendent has proposed adding to the Student Success metric for elementary and middle schools participation and mastery in “non-tested” subjects aligned with the *Profile of the South Carolina Graduate*. This new metric will meet the stated goal of ESSA to promote a well-rounded education. In 2017-18, the SCDE will be convening stakeholders to develop a metric to document student participation and progress to “meets expectations” performance levels in elementary and middle school non-tested subjects including: the arts, technology, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and

Mathematics subject areas), World languages, physical education, and character education. The SCDE anticipates an amendment to this plan to include these measures in 2018-19.

### **Student Success Indicator: Elementary and Middle School**

The student success indicator for elementary and middle schools currently (for 2017-18) has two metrics:

1. *Preparing for Success* – The aggregate number of number of elementary/middle school students who score at Levels 1-5 on the **South Carolina Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (SCPASS)** in science and social studies. \*Counted for ten points in the weighted point index accountability metric (i). A full explanation of the validity, reliability, and comparability of SCPASS science and social studies assessments was provided in the Achievement background information in Section A on page 21 (ii).
2. *College & Career Readiness* – Students scoring within grade level ranges in Lexiles and Quantiles on the state summative tests in ELA and mathematics will be reported as the percentage of students at each grade level who are “on track” to college and career readiness. This is a reported element” only – it is not counted in the weighted point index (i.).

### **Background for Preparing for Success Metric**

\*See background of Achievement metric presented previously for documentation on SCPASS science and social studies assessments.

#### **1. Preparing for Success Points Elementary and Middle**

Total Points Available: 10

Table 21 below shows the points students earn when at each level on the SCPASS science and social studies assessment. The shaded area of the table indicates a change in available points per level when the new performance levels are applied in the 2017–18 testing for science only. All simulations for science are based on 2016 results, which are on the five-level SCPASS scale. Social studies simulations will also be on the 2016 five-level scale and will remain on that scale until 2019.

**Table 21: Test Score to Points Conversion – SCPASS**

Points	SCPASS Social Studies 2010–2019	SCPASS Science 2010–2017	SCPASS Science (2017–18)
0	Level 1 <b>Not Met 1</b>	Level 1 <b>Not Met 1</b>	Level 1 <b>Does Not Meet</b>
1	Level 2 <b>Not Met 2</b>	Level 2 <b>Not Met 2</b>	Level 2 <b>Approaches Expectations</b>
2	Level 3 <b>Met</b>	Level 3 <b>Met</b>	Level 3 <b>Meets Expectations</b>
3	Level 4 <b>Exemplary 4</b>	Level 4 <b>Exemplary 4</b>	Level 4 <b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
4	Level 5 <b>Exemplary 5</b>	Level 5 <b>Exemplary 5</b>	

**How Points Are Earned:**

A *Preparing for Success* rating will be generated by assigning points to each student's level score on the state summative tests, with greater points awarded for higher levels of proficiency. The students' points are aggregated across all science and social studies assessments. The school's performance is measured as a percentage of the maximum points available across assessments and the ratio is converted to an index.

**Students included in elementary/middle rating:**

1. The assessments of students who were continuously enrolled are included. Students who are enrolled on the 45th day of the school year and on the 160th day of the school year without being withdrawn from enrollment for more than five days during this time are included.
2. Student test scores in science and social studies are included.
3. Students who took alternate assessments are included in ratings.
4. Eligible non-native English speaking students were exempted from calculation. Note: ELs in their first two years in a U.S. school are assessed in all applicable tested subjects, but removed from the *Preparing for Success* metric similar to the Achievement metric (2 years only).
5. Students who should have taken a subject area test, but did not, are assigned 0 points for that test and included in the denominator.
6. Students who take a high school end-of-course assessment in middle school will not be included in the *Preparing for Success* rating at the middle school for those assessments. Advanced students will take SC READY and EOCEP. However, the school report card may include the end-of-course assessment results for middle school students who took an end-of-course assessment.

**Steps to calculate the *Preparing for Success* rating:**

1. For each student/test combination, points are awarded using Table 21 (*see above*).
2. For each student/test combination, a maximum number of possible points are also assigned (4-points for SCPASS s social studies /3-points for SCPASS science).
3. The sum of the points awarded is obtained by summing across students and tests.
4. The sum of the possible points is obtained by summing across students and tests.
5. The percentage of possible points earned is obtained by dividing the total obtained in (3) by the total obtained in (4).
6. The points on the 10-points scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 10, which is then rounded to tenths place (e.g., 6.7).

**Preparing for Success Indicator Summative Rating:  
Elementary/Middle**


*Preparing for Success* Summative Ratings will be reported in five categories: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

The results of converting student assessment results into a school rating, using the assessments administered in grades 3–8 in school year 2015–16 are noted below. Based on the 10-point scale, the mean or average points earned by both elementary and middle schools was 5.0.

**Table 22: Summary Results for Elementary and Middle Schools Preparing for Success: SCPASS Science & Social Studies**

Result	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	All Schools (N=959) – includes duplicate Elementary and Middle			
Percent of possible points	49.0	12.3	12.9	91.5
Points on the 10-point scale	4.9	1.2	1.3	9.1
<b>Elementary Schools (N=645)</b>				
Percent of possible points	48.5	12.1	12.9	80
Points on the 10-point scale	4.8	1.2	1.3	8
<b>Middle Schools (N=314)</b>				
Percent of possible points	50.1	12.7	19.2	91.5
Points on the 10-point scale	5.0	1.3	1.9	9.1

The distribution of social studies and science Achievement scores on the 10 point scale is presented below.



**Recommended Indicator Rating:**

The tables below show the point distribution for each rating level broken down by elementary and middle schools separately.

**Table 23: *Preparing for Success* Ratings for Elementary Schools**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores*	Percent of Schools
Excellent	10	6.42 – 10.00	10.1
Good	15	5.65 – 6.41	15.0
Average	40	4.35 – 5.64	40.0
Below Average	25	3.26 – 4.34	25.1
Unsatisfactory	10	0.0 – 3.25	9.8

**Table 24: *Preparing for Success* Ratings for Middle Schools**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores	Percent of Schools
Excellent	10	6.67 – 10.00	10.2
Good	15	5.76 – 6.66	15.0
Average	40	4.52 – 5.75	40.1
Below Average	25	3.36 – 4.51	24.5
Unsatisfactory	10	0.0 – 3.35	10.2

**Table 25: Summary of *Preparing for Success* Ratings for Elementary and Middle Schools with Ranges of Scores Unique to School Type.**

Rating	Target %	School Type*		All Schools
		Elementary	Middle	
Excellent	10	10.1	10.2	10.1
Good	15	15.0	15.0	15.0
Average	40	40.0	40.1	40.0
Below Average	25	25.1	24.5	24.9
Unsatisfactory	10	9.8	10.2	9.9

**2. College & Career Readiness (Elementary/Middle)**

Total Points Available = 0 points

Reported element only – not a part of the weighted point index


The second student success indicator for elementary and middle school using SC READY in ELA and mathematics achievement results to report the percentage of students in grades 3–8 who have scored within the grade level Lexile and Quantile ranges to document that the students are “on track” to college and career readiness. A sample student score report that will be sent to all South Carolina students on SC READY results is shown below. The graph indicates

- the student’s current Lexile and Quantile level,
- the interquartile grade level ranges for reading and mathematics,
- the student’s predicted growth path through grade 12, and
- the student’s recommended growth path for college and career readiness.




### The Lexile® Framework for Reading

Matching readers with texts



### The Quantile® Framework for Mathematics

Linking assessment with mathematics instruction



### **Student Success Indicator: High School**

The student success indicator for high schools also has two metrics:

1. *Preparing for Success* – The aggregate number of number of high school students who score at Levels 1–5 on U.S. History and Biology End of Course Assessments (EOCEPs)
2. *College & Career Readiness* – The percentage of high school students meeting any one of the nine college/career readiness indicators.

For high schools, both metrics will be counted in the weighted point index to meaningfully differentiate schools with Preparing for Success counting 10 points and College and Career Readiness counting 25 points (i).

Both metrics will be calculated and reported for all students and all subgroups, including: economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, EL, and students with disabilities (iii).

### **Background for Preparing for Success Metric**

\*See background of Achievement metric presented previously for documentation on high school EOCEPs for science and social studies assessments on page 21 (ii).

#### **1. Preparing for Success Points (High School)**

Total Points Available: 10 points (with or without ELP)

Table 26 below shows the points students earn when at each level on the high school EOCEPs for U.S History and Biology.

**Table 26: Test Score to Points Conversion – Biology and US History and the Constitution**

<b>Points</b>	<b>EOCEP Grade Level</b>
0	F
1	D
2	C
3	B
4	A

### **Students Included in the Rating:**

1. Scores for all students in the graduation cohort for the current year were included, assigned to the school of their enrollment on the 160th day.
2. Students who were enrolled on the 45th day of the school year and on the 160th day of the school year without being withdrawn from enrollment for more than five days during this time.
3. Student test scores in South Carolina Alternate Assessment (SC-Alt) Science (High School), EOCEP Biology 1 and U.S. History and the Constitution that were obtained at any previous time are included.



4. For each student, the highest score in each subject area is the score for that student.
5. Students receiving EL services who have been in the United States for only the 2015 and 2016 school years are omitted from analyses.
6. Students who should have taken a subject area test, but did not, are assigned 0 points for that test and included in the denominator.

#### **Steps in Creating Preparing for Success Rating**

1. For each student/test combination, points are awarded using Table 1.
2. For each student/test combination, a maximum number of 4 possible points is assigned.
3. The sum of the points awarded is obtained by summing across students and tests.
4. The sum of the possible points is obtained by summing across students and tests.
5. The percentage of possible points earned is obtained by dividing the total obtained in (3) by the total obtained in (4).
6. The points on the 10-point scale are obtained by multiplying the percentage of points obtained in (5) by 7.5, which is then rounded to hundredths place (e.g., 8.57).

Summary statistics of the percentage of students *Preparing for Success* expressed on a 100-point scale and transformed to a 10-point scale are presented below in Table 27.

**Table 27: Biology and U.S. History and the Constitution EOCEP Ranges of Points Transformed to 7.5 Scale**

EOCEP Score Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Percent of Total Points	42.9	15.0	5.6	99.0
10 Point Scale	4.3	1.5	0.55	9.9

#### **Recommended Indicator Rating:**


Ranges of Scores and Percent of Schools receiving each rating (matches achievement percentages for ELA and mathematics).

**Table 28: Targets and Ranges of Scores on Biology and U.S. History and the Constitution EOCEPs**

Rating	Target %	Range of Scores	Percent of Schools
Excellent	<b>10</b>	6.100 – 10.00	10.4
Good	<b>15</b>	5.207 – 6.599	14.8
Average	<b>40</b>	3.706 – 5.206	40.0
Below Average	<b>25</b>	2.477 – 3.705	24.8
Unsatisfactory	<b>10</b>	0.00 – 2.476	10.0

The distribution of high school *Preparing for Success* on the 10-point scale is presented below. The scores range from 0.55 to 9.9. There is a

slight skewness, but nothing that would indicate that schools will be advantaged or disadvantaged using this measure.



2. **The College & Career Ready indicator** for high schools measures the degree to which students are ready for post-secondary opportunities based on meeting any one of nine state-identified college and career readiness criterion.

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
<b>iii. College and Career Readiness</b>  <b>High District State</b>	<p>The student success indicator will aggregate across nine indicators of college and career readiness to measure the degree to which students are <i>College and Career Ready</i> by the end of grade 12.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Points will be earned for the unduplicated number of students who achieve any one of the nine measures to meaningfully differentiate high school performance.</p>	<p><b><u>By grade 12, a student may demonstrate “college readiness” on one or more of the following indicators:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT composite score of 20;</li> <li>• SAT benchmarks of 1020;</li> <li>• Advanced Placement (AP) exams of 3 or higher in <del>English, mathematics, science, social studies, or AP Capstone</del> <b>*any College Board Advanced Placement course;</b></li> <li>• IB) exams of 4 or higher in <del>English, mathematics, science, and social studies</del> <b>* any International Baccalaureate Higher Level course;</b> or</li> <li>• Six hours of dual credit coursework in <b>English, Social Studies, STEM</b> (two-year/four-year college transfer courses with a grade of C or higher))</li> </ul> <p><del>*NOTE: The State Superintendent has recommended that all AP and IB courses and social studies dual credit coursework be included in the college readiness metrics. This recommendation is under discussion and will be taken up by the Education Oversight Committee in its December 2017 meeting.</del></p> <p>South Carolina recognizes the value of multiple metrics for college and career readiness to achieve the <i>Profile</i>. Students have multiple pathways to college and careers depending upon their goals. Metrics to measure student “readiness” for college and/or careers are not inherently equivalent. The comparability of this measure lies in the premise that students should demonstrate agreed upon evidence that they are “ready” for the next level (i.e. two-year college, four-year college, or careers) based upon any one of the nine measures vetted by the state and based upon the standard that they do not need remediation or significant on the job training (OJT) to enter their next level.</p> <p><b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability, research-based:</u></b></p> <p>ACT® Benchmarks</p> <p>“The ACT College Readiness Benchmarks are the minimum ACT test scores required for students to have a high probability of success in credit-bearing college courses—English Composition I, social sciences courses, College Algebra, or Biology.”</p> <p>“Students who meet a Benchmark on the ACT have approximately a 50% chance of earning a B or better and approximately a 75% chance or better of earning a C or better in the corresponding college course or courses.”</p> <p>“The ACT College Readiness Benchmarks are empirically derived based on the actual performance of students in college.”</p>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		<p><b><u>ACT composite score to take a credit-bearing course</u></b>  States have tracked students into their first year credit-bearing mathematics and English courses at two-year and four-year colleges to determine a valid, reliable, and comparable ACT cut score that predicts readiness for courses beyond the developmental level. For example, Kentucky has tracked students into the freshman year to determine that ACT scores of 18-English, 20-Reading, and 20-Mathematics were predictive of success in entry level credit bearing math and English courses. Similarly, Mississippi set ACT cuts for taking a credit bearing course at 15-English and 18-Mathematics. Some states have used a composite ACT score to make the same prediction. For example, North Carolina also tracked its data to determine a composite cut score (17) is needed for entry into courses above developmental level. Tennessee set a composite score of 21. Using these reports from other states, the EOC in South Carolina proposes the use an ACT composite of 20.</p> <p><b><u>Advanced Placement, IB, and Dual Credit</u></b>  South Carolina statute mandates that students who score a 3 or higher on AP exams and 4 or higher on IB exams may receive college credit for those courses in public colleges and universities. South Carolina colleges currently accept these scores as credit-bearing scores, but may determine if the credit counts as elective or core. Research shows that students who take AP or IB courses in high school have a greater likelihood of success in college. Core content areas currently counted in this metric include AP/IB exams in English, mathematics, science, or social studies. Similarly, the South Carolina General Assembly has appropriated add-on weighting funding for dual credit courses. All dual credit courses must be validated and transcribed by a partner Institution of Higher Education. Dual credit college courses must count in the students post-secondary GPA. Core content areas currently counted in this metric include dual credit courses in English, mathematics, and science, which lead to an Associates or baccalaureate degree.  *NOTE: The State Superintendent has recommended that all AP and IB courses and social studies dual credit coursework be included in the college readiness metrics. This recommendation is under discussion and will be taken up by the EOC in its December 2017 meeting. If approved, it would be effective for the 2017-18 school year.</p> <p><b><u>Comparability for South Carolina High Schools</u></b>  All grade 11 students in South Carolina are offered a college entrance examination (ACT or SAT) paid for by the state. Advanced Placement course examinations are also completely paid by the state. Those districts with small high schools that cannot offer the full range of AP courses have access to VirtualSC Advanced Placement courses (where AP exam pass rates exceed the national average in all but two subjects). The small number of districts which offer the International Baccalaureate program, pay for those examinations with no cost to students. Finally, dual credit/dual enrollment courses are subsidized by the State using .15 add-on weighting to the base student cost for all students enrolled in college level courses in high school. South Carolina</p>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		<p>has ensured access and equity to the college ready measures outlined in the accountability model.</p> <p><b><u>By grade 12, a student may demonstrate “Career Readiness” on one or more of the following indicators:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>WorkKeys</del> <b>Worldwide Interactive Network</b> National Career Readiness Certificate of Silver, Gold, or Platinum;</li> <li>• ASVAB score of 31 or higher;</li> <li>• Completion of a <del>registered Youth Apprenticeship program*</del> <b>South Carolina approved work-based learning experience with a successful employer exit evaluation;</b> or</li> <li>• Completion of a Career and Technical Education (CATE) program <b>pathway</b> with <b>a state or</b> nationally-recognized industry credential, or state credential when no national credential is available, that leads to living wage as <b>certified recommended by business and industry representatives in South Carolina and approved by the Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council</b> Department of Commerce, Department of Employment and Workforce, South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce, and State Superintendent of Education.</li> </ul> <p><del>*NOTE: The State Superintendent has recommended that the career readiness metric also include the following: (1) a successful work based learning experience with an exit evaluation from an employer; (2) a state approved end of pathway assessment to document career readiness; (3) any state or nationally recognized industry credential; and (4) once developed (not before 2018-19) the S.C. Employability Credential aligned to students’ IEPs and career transition plans including a career portfolio, work readiness assessment results, and work based learning training totaling at least 360 hours. These recommendations are under discussion and will be considered by the EOC at its December 2017 meeting.</del></p> <p><b><u>Validity, reliability, comparability, researched-based:</u></b></p> <p><b>Career-Readiness Assessment</b></p> <p>South Carolina requires a career-readiness assessment for high school students <b>in their third year of high school</b>. In 2016 and 2017, all 11th grade students were assessed using ACT WorkKeys®. <del>ACT WorkKeys® has historically contained</del> <b>As a result of a state competitive procurement, the career readiness assessment that South Carolina will give in 2018 will be the Worldwide Interactive Network (WIN) Career Readiness Assessment. Like the WorkKeys product, this assessment measures three core tests domains</b> (Reading for Information, Applied Mathematics, and Locating Information). The assessments each report Level Scores, which identify skill levels. Levels range from &lt; 3 to 7 (or 6 for Locating Information). Each level includes a broad range of skills.</p> <p>Students who successfully complete these three tests may be eligible for <del>ACT’s</del> <b>WIN’s</b> National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC). Based</p>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		<p>upon performance, students may earn a bronze, silver, gold, or platinum certificate, as described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bronze - scores at least a level 3 in each of the three core areas (employable for 16 percent of jobs)</li> <li>• Silver - scores at least a level 4 in each of the three core areas (employable for 65 percent of jobs)</li> <li>• Gold - scores at least a level 5 in each of the three core areas (employable for 93 percent of jobs)</li> <li>• Platinum - scores at least a level 6 in each of the three core areas (SCDE, 2015)</li> </ul> <p><i>All score levels and certificate levels were developed, named, and described by ACT. <del>NOTE Worldwide Interactive Network.</del> In 2017, the South Carolina Education Accountability Act was revised to reference offering a career readiness assessment to 11th grade students. The procurement for a career readiness assessment is currently (October 2017) underway. Please also note that in June 2017, the ACT WorkKeys® assessments were changed. Therefore, it is possible that this metric for career readiness will change.</i></p> <p><b><u>Registered Youth Apprenticeship*</u></b></p> <p>Youth Apprenticeship provides South Carolina high school students the unique opportunity to combine high school and/or technical college curriculum with critical on-the-job training at a local business/industry. Students can also earn a pay check while earning a national credential at the same time as earning their high school diplomas. The established process for creating a registered youth apprenticeship program in South Carolina is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Identify Partners</del>—Education partners and Apprenticeship Carolina identify business partners and occupations of interest.</li> <li>2. <del>Conduct Meetings</del>—Meetings with businesses are held to determine the following: availability and allowability of on-the-job training, job related education, the wage schedule and the apprentice selection process.</li> <li>3. <del>Qualified Candidates</del>—Education partner advises students/parents of opportunity and identifies qualified candidates.</li> <li>4. <del>Collect Applications</del>—Employer is ready to hire youth apprentices and contacts education partner to collect applications.</li> <li>5. <del>Conduct Interviews</del>—Employer interviews and hires student for youth apprenticeship.</li> <li>6. <del>Conduct Training</del>—Student begins on the job training (OJT) and job related education (JRE). This step includes technical college dual credit opportunities.</li> <li>7. <del>Students Graduate</del>—Students graduate with high school diploma, Department of Labor (DOL) credential, and other applicable credentials.</li> <li>8. <del>Career Skills</del>—Youth Apprenticeship Completers can continue</li> </ol>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <i>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</i>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <i>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</i>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <i>-What are the measures used?</i> <i>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</i> <i>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</i>
		<p>with adult apprenticeship, be hired full time with business, or have skills for a successful career.</p> <p><del>*NOTE: The State Superintendent has recommended that the career readiness metric also include the following: (1) a successful work based learning experience with an exit evaluation from an employer; (2) a state approved end of pathway assessment to document career readiness; (3) any state or nationally recognized industry credential; and (4) once developed (not before 2018-19) the S.C. Employability Credential aligned to students' IEPs and career transition plans including a career portfolio, work readiness assessment results, and work-based learning training totaling at least 360 hours. These recommendations are under discussion and the EOC will consider them at its December 2017 meeting.</del></p> <p><b><u>Approved South Carolina Work-based Learning Experience</u></b>  Work-based learning (WBL) is a school-coordinated, sponsored, coherent sequence of workplace experiences that are related to students' career goals and/or interests, are based on instructional preparation, and are performed in partnership with local businesses, industries, or other organizations in the community. WBL enables students to apply classroom instruction in a real-world business or service-oriented work environment.</p> <p>Examples of WBL experiences considered for career readiness in the accountability system:</p> <p><b><u>1. Apprenticeship (includes registered apprenticeships and youth apprenticeships):</u></b> An earn-while-you-learn training model that combines on-the-job training, job-related education, and a scalable wage progression. This forward-focus program combines classroom instruction with one to two years of on-the-job training with an end result in a "certification of mastery of a specific technical skill."</p> <p><b><u>2. Cooperative Education (Co-Op):</u></b> A structured training program for high school level students requiring a written contract and training plan between the high school and sponsored worksite. The written training and evaluation plans guide workplace activities in coordination with classroom instruction. Students receive course credit for their Co-Op completion. Academic credit, compensation, and activities may vary within the course of study.</p> <p><b><u>Internship:</u></b> A progressive, school-coordinated experience that places students in real workplace environments so that they develop and practice career-related knowledge and skills needed for a specific level job. An internship provides hands-on experience in a particular industry or occupation related to a student's career interests, abilities, and goals. A learning contract outlines the expectations and responsibilities of the high school and worksite including a specified number of hours in the training agreement. The high school intern works regularly during or after school in exchange for the worksite mentor's time in teaching and</p>

<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <b>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</b>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <b>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</b>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <b>-What are the measures used?</b> <b>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</b> <b>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</b>
		<p>demonstrating. An internship usually lasts 3–6 months, depending on hours of completion requirements. Internship may or may not include financial compensation. Prior to an internship, the student receives the established criteria and guidelines from the workplace supervisor. The supervisor evaluates the student and the school representative evaluates the student through on-site visits. Academic credit, compensation, and activities are district specific and may vary with the course of study.</p> <p><b>A student will be deemed “career ready,” using this indicator if he/she</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successfully completes a state-approved WBL exit evaluation from an employer. The WBL program must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include a training agreement which defines a combination of objectives/skills to be mastered and a minimum of 40 practical experience hours or the highest number of hours required by the industry-defined competencies in a career pathway;</li> <li>○ Be aligned with the sixteen career clusters;</li> <li>○ Include an industry evaluation that is created from the training agreement, which includes the world-class skills from the <i>Profile of the South Carolina Graduate</i> (sample evaluation forms are provided in the South Carolina work-based learning guidelines); and</li> <li>○ Provide one unit of credit in the pathway related to the work-based placement or completed a personal pathway of study.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>To ensure consistency in reporting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) All districts and schools will be required to follow the requirements in the <i>SCDE Work-based Learning Implementation Guidelines</i> and all results will be reported and uploaded into secure data transfer system (2018) and into the Student Information System – PowerSchool (2019 and beyond).</li> <li>2) The SCDE must deliver regional training for the implementation of this initiative and Career Development Facilitators (CDFs) and Work-based Learning Coordinators will be required to attend.</li> <li>3) A statewide delivery system will occur through the Office of Career and Technology Education (OCTE) and SC Regional Career Specialists team (RWLC).</li> <li>4) Educators and business partners will design opportunities for students together through School Advisory Committees.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Career &amp; Technical Education (CATE) Completer and State or Nationally recognized Industry Credential</u></b></p> <p>A “CATE Completer” is a “CATE Concentrator” who has earned <i>all</i> of the required units in a state-recognized CATE program identified by the assigned Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. A state-</p>



<b>Accountability Indicator</b> <b>-At what levels will the indicator be applied</b>	<b>Accountability Measure</b> <b>-How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?</b>	<b>Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure</b> <b>-What are the measures used?</b> <b>-Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable?</b> <b>-Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?</b>
		<p>recognized CATE program must be composed of an approved sequence of career and technology education courses leading to a career goal and must include a minimum of three Carnegie units of credit. High schools report "Completers" on the CATE page in PowerSchool, based upon state and federal Perkins IV accountability guidelines outlined in the CATE Student Reporting Procedures Guide.</p> <p>The current plan is to award career readiness points for program completers <del>with a</del> <b>who also earn a state or</b> nationally-recognized industry credential, <del>or a state-recognized one when there is no national credential.</del> The State Superintendent has recommended that this be changed to any state <del>or nationally recognized industry credential;</del> that recommendation is under discussion and may come before the EOC in December 2017. <b>The South Carolina Department of Education, Department of Employment and Workforce, and Department of Commerce jointly surveyed business sectors in South Carolina for feedback on the state and national certifications valued by business and industry. From this feedback, a list of industry credentials and certifications by career cluster was recommended by the Coordinating Committee for the Education and Economic Development Act Committee and the Coordinating Council for Workforce Development for inclusion in the accountability model for the career readiness metric.</b> High schools report national and state certifications and credentials received by CATE students on the CATE page in PowerSchool. Up to ten certifications can be entered for each student. The state-recognized industry certifications and credentials are identified and coded within the CATE Student Reporting Procedures Guide (See CATE Student Reporting Procedures Guide at <a href="http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/career-and-technology-education/performance-accountability/cate-data-collection-and-reporting/">http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/career-and-technology-education/performance-accountability/cate-data-collection-and-reporting/</a>).</p> <p>A report entitled, <i>The Path Least Taken III: Rigor and Focus in High School Pays Dividends in the Future</i> from the Center for Public Education (CPE) finds that opportunities comparable to those offered by attendance at a four-year college can be found in rigorous high school programs leading to a professional certification. CPE compared social and economic outcomes between students with a four-year college degree and "high-credentialed" students with no degree. High-credentialed students were those who demonstrated success in both academic and technical courses and who obtained a professional certification. Ultimately, the study found that "high-credentialed" students with no degree were just as likely to be employed full-time, to be satisfied with their jobs, and to vote in a recent election by age 26 as were students with four-year degrees. The study also found that, among students who pursued but did not complete a postsecondary degree, those who graduated from a rigorous high school program had more positive social and economic outcomes overall. The Profile of the South Carolina Graduate emphasizes rigorous college and career preparation in high school to provide students with the economic safety net along the pathway to a higher degree (<a href="https://careertech.org/resource/path-least-">https://careertech.org/resource/path-least-</a></p>

Accountability Indicator -At what levels will the indicator be applied	Accountability Measure -How will the measure assist with meaningful differentiation?	Assessment Description in the Accountability Measure -What are the measures used? -Are the measures valid, reliable, and comparable? -Are they based on research to positively impact student learning, graduation, and/or college/career readiness?														
		<p>taken-3).</p> <p>South Carolina’s accountability model will incentivize both college and career readiness opportunities to maximize options for ALL students. 2012 U.S. Census data suggest that adult workers with “alternative credentials,” such as professional licensure, certifications or educational certificates falling outside the traditional associate’s or bachelor’s degree, experience greater employment stability and higher earnings than adults without an alternative credential (Stephanie Ewert and Robert Kominski, U.S. Census Bureau, Measuring Alternative Education Credentials: 2012, January 2014.)</p> <p><b>ASVAB</b> The minimum score needed for a high school graduate to enlist in the Armed Services with a high school diploma is as follows:</p> <table><tr><th><u>Branch</u></th><th><u>Score</u></th></tr><tr><td>Air Force</td><td>36</td></tr><tr><td>Army</td><td>31</td></tr><tr><td>Coast Guard</td><td>40</td></tr><tr><td>Marine Corps</td><td>32</td></tr><tr><td>National Guard</td><td>31</td></tr><tr><td>Navy</td><td>35</td></tr></table> <p>South Carolina will track the percentage of students of 31 or higher for career readiness for the military and get data on the number of military bases in South Carolina and on the number of job opportunities in the military.</p> <p><b><u>Comparability in South Carolina High Schools:</u></b> South Carolina requires and pays for all students in grade 11 to take a career readiness assessment (WorkKeys in 2016 and 2017 and WIN Career Readiness in 2018 forward). The state also provides \$3 million in additional funds to pay for industry certification examinations. Money is allocated to districts based on student requests for the examinations. ASVAB is widely given across South Carolina and is free to students. Work-based learning opportunities are available in all districts.</p>	<u>Branch</u>	<u>Score</u>	Air Force	36	Army	31	Coast Guard	40	Marine Corps	32	National Guard	31	Navy	35
<u>Branch</u>	<u>Score</u>															
Air Force	36															
Army	31															
Coast Guard	40															
Marine Corps	32															
National Guard	31															
Navy	35															

### **College and Career Readiness Indicator Points:**

Total Available Points: 25

How Points Are Earned: Progress towards having students achieve the *Profile of the South Carolina Graduate* requires the state to improve college and career readiness of all students along the continuum. Points are earned for each grade 12 student who meets one or more criteria for “college ready” or one or more criteria for “career ready” to be deemed “prepared for success.”

### Students Included in the Rating:

For school year 2017–18, the state would use the 2018 graduation cohort and determine by student the following:

1. What percentage of students in the 2018 graduating cohort were college ready? The student
  - a. scores a composite score of 20 or higher on the ACT test.
  - b. scores a composite score of 1020 or higher on the SAT test.
  - c. scores a 3 or higher on an AP exam (~~see notes above concerning pending changes on which courses~~);
  - d. scores a 4 or higher on an IB assessment in ~~English, mathematics, science, or social studies~~ (~~see notes above concerning pending changes on which courses~~);
  - e. completes at least six (6) credit hours in dual credit/enrollment two-year/four-year college transfer courses in an English, **Social Studies, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics** ~~or mathematics course or STEM course with a grade of C or higher. STEM includes a science or computer science course. (See notes above concerning pending addition of social studies.)~~
2. What percentage of students in the 2018 graduation cohort were career ready? The student
  - a. is a CATE completer and earns a **state or** nationally-recognized industry credential, or state-recognized when no national credential exists (see note above about pending changes);
  - b. earns a Silver, Gold, or Platinum National Career Readiness Certificate on the ~~WorkKeys~~ **WIN Career Readiness** exam (~~or later described criteria under a to-be-procured career readiness assessment~~);
  - c. earns a scale score of 31 or higher on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB); or
  - d. completes a ~~registered apprenticeship through Apprenticeship South Carolina~~ (~~see notes above concerning pending changes related to work-based learning and the SC Employability credential~~) **South Carolina approved WBL credit bearing course with a successful employer evaluation. Note: the WBL credit must be a minimum of 40 hours on the job, include a training agreement, be aligned to the state career clusters, be approved for a course credit, and document a successful employer evaluation.**

For accountability, South Carolina will count the percentage of the four-year graduation cohort that is **college or career ready**.

For transparency, South Carolina will report separately the unduplicated percentage of the four-year graduation cohort that is college ready, career ready, college OR career ready, and college AND career ready.

All nine individual college and career metrics will also be reported separately using the grade 12 graduation cohort as the denominator.

**Steps to Create the College and Career Readiness Indicator:**

1. Find the grade 12 graduation cohort.
2. Find the number of students in the grade 12 graduation cohort who have met at least one of the college or career readiness benchmarks.
3. Divide (2) by (1) to produce a percentage of grade 12 students who are ~~Prepared for Success~~ *College and Career Ready*.
4. Multiply number by the weight of the category.

**College and Career Readiness Summative Rating:**

The *College and Career Readiness* summative rating will be reported on five levels:

Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

Table 29 below shows the number of high schools with students achieving college and career readiness based on the 2016 grade 11 statewide administration of ACT and WorkKeys (1.0). These numbers represent a good baseline for setting rating targets for the nine indicators that will be available in the 2018 college and career readiness accountability metric. Based on these results, the proposed target percentages are listed in Table 29 below.

**Table 29: Number of High Schools in 2016 with Graduating Seniors who were College Ready, Career Ready, College OR Career Ready, or College AND Career Ready**


% of Students in School	HS with this % College Ready	HS with this % Career Ready	College OR Career Ready	College AND Career Ready
90.1 to 100%	1	6	7	1
80.1 to 90%	2	17	20	1
70.1 to 80%	1	45	49	2
60.1 to 70%	8	65	60	8
50.1 to 60%	12	35	35	11
40.1 to 50%	32	30	29	28
30.1 to 40%	54	9	7	56
20.1 to 30%	33	9	9	34
10.1 to 20%	48	1	1	49
0 to 10%	26	0	0	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>217</b>

*Note: These data are based solely upon ACT and WorkKeys results from 2016 where ALL grade 11 students participated in the metrics. Other college and career ready metrics will be added to the 2017–18 calculations for accountability.*

**Table 30: Number and percentage of high schools in each target range**

Rating	Target % of Students CCR	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Excellent	80 – 100	27	12%
Good	70 – 79	49	23%
Average	60 – 69	60	28%
Below Average	50 – 59	35	16%
Unsatisfactory	49 & below	46	21%

*Note: These data are based solely upon ACT and WorkKeys results from 2016 where ALL grade 11 students participated in the metrics. Other college and career ready metrics will be added to the 2017–18 calculations for accountability.*



- e. **School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s).** Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

The School Quality Indicator measures the *Positive & Effective Learning Environment* of the school in grades 3–12. This metric is a student engagement survey to determine the degree to which the school climate supports and fosters high levels of engagement as perceived by a majority of the student population. The student engagement survey will be broken down by all students and accountability subgroups. The subgroups reported will be economically disadvantaged, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, Native American, Hispanic, ELs, and students with disabilities.

The State Superintendent has recommended that, effective 2018-19, the School Quality metric have bonus points for documented continuous improvement initiatives and high quality curricular programs (such as STEM, STEAM, Arts in Basic Curriculum, Primary Years International Baccalaureate Programme) for schools that receive externally validated scores on national or international program evaluation rubrics. She has also recommended other student-centered measures of school quality by analyzing unduplicated student participation in academic clubs and competitions, service learning programs, sports, and co-curricular ~~curricular~~ programs. These recommendations are under discussion and will be considered by the EOC at its December 2017 meeting.

Indicator	Details
<p>The school quality indicator will aggregate the number and percentage of students who report different levels of engagement in school.</p> <p>Note: A tiered point system will be used to document differences in engagement levels to meaningfully <b>differentiate between schools.</b></p>	<p><b>Engagement Tool – TBD (under procurement)</b></p> <p><b>The survey will be procured in 2016–17 and will have the following criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be of reasonable length (25–35 items) to render valid and results;</li> <li>• Be based upon the student’s personal experiences in the classroom;</li> <li>• Include a Likert style rating model of at least four levels;</li> <li>• Include a combination of response types and rating scales including the following: frequency, frequency time, belief, agreement, quality, and reflection of self;</li> <li>• Be aligned to observation tools or other measures of school climate and culture used in South Carolina for school and district continuous improvement;</li> <li>• Provide data on cognitive, behavioral, and emotional/affective learning domains;</li> <li>• Produce a final student engagement level for accountability purposes and for actionable improvement opportunities for schools;</li> <li>• Integrate with data systems currently in use in South Carolina for ease for administering the survey and disaggregating results;</li> <li>• Use a unique student identification number tied to the student information system so that it can be disaggregated by sub-groups</li> </ul> <p>Note: The State Superintendent has recommended for 2018-19 adoption of additional School Quality metric related to externally validated continuous improvement scores that generate an Index of Educational Quality for all schools and externally validated program evaluations at the elementary and middle school levels which are pending and will be discussed in December 2017 (see above).</p> <p>The AdvancED Student Engagement Survey is designed to measure elementary, middle and high school student engagement through students’ responses to items about their learning experiences. The survey delves deeply into student classroom experiences and provides actionable data to improve teaching and learning. Specifically, the survey measures student engagement through self-reported student opinions about their learning experiences.</p> <p>The survey consists of 20 items categorized into three domains of engagement: behavioral, cognitive and emotional (Fredricks et al., 2004).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Behavioral engagement refers to a student’s efforts in the classroom;</li> <li>• Cognitive engagement examines a student’s investment in learning;</li> <li>• Emotional engagement measures a student’s emotions or feelings about the classroom and school.</li> </ul> <p>Each of the domains is further broken down into three categories of engagement quality and each category reports two distinct levels (Schlechty, 2011).</p>

Indicator	Details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Invested</li> <li>○ Immersed</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Compliant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strategic</li> <li>○ Ritual</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disengaged <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Retreatism</li> <li>○ Rebellion</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The survey is available in three grade bands – Elementary, Middle, and High School – with similar content adapted in age and grade appropriate language. Each version has different characteristics psychometrically and must be considered independently when scoring. Students completing the survey are labeled as “Committed,” “Compliant,” or “Disengaged” across each of the three domains. This label is based on which component of engagement the respondent answers the majority of the time within each domain. It should be noted that the Behavioral domain has six items which means it is possible that a respondent has an even number of responses across two or more components. In these cases, the respondent is labeled as having a “mixed” engagement type.</p> <p><b>Validity, reliability, comparability, research-based:</b>  Research shows the combination of high student engagement and effective learning environments are key drivers for improvement in student achievement. “If students are not engaged, there is little, if any, chance that they will learn” (Heflebower, Marzano, &amp; Pickering, 2011). When teachers use behavioral, cognitive, affective engagement strategies, they help their students overcome some of the risk factors for dropping out of school (Balfanz, Herzog, and McIver, 2007). To that end, South Carolina proposes the use of a valid, reliable, and comparable student engagement survey administered in grades 3–12 annually (January; for 2018 upon procurement if later) to measure student perceptions of the school’s climate and culture for learning in the following research-based areas at a minimum: <i>Equitable Learning, High Expectations, Supportive Learning, Active Learning, Progress Monitoring and Feedback, Well-managed Learning, and Digital Learning</i>. Additionally, the student engagement survey should provide actionable data on the level of student engagement across behavioral, cognitive, and emotional/affective domains to determine the degree to which students report that they are highly engaged, compliant, or disengaged in school.</p> <p>A pilot study was conducted by AdvancED in 2017 with a total sample size of 20,494 students from a representative sample of students from three states: Alabama, North Dakota, and South Carolina. The following summary report and tables were published by ©AdvancED Education, Inc. to validate the survey tool.</p> <p><u>Sampling:</u> The characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1. Special attention was given to the oversampling of minority groups within the original sampling framework in order to test for any bias that could have arisen between testing groups based on any demographic characteristic.</p>

Indicator	Details																																																																																
	<table><tr><th colspan="4">Table 1. Sample Size of the Pilot Study with Race Percentages by Groups</th></tr><tr><th>Race/Ethnicity</th><th>High School</th><th>Middle School</th><th>Elementary School</th></tr><tr><td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td><td>1.0%</td><td>2.0%</td><td>2.7%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>1.5%</td><td>0.9%</td><td>0.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Black or African American</td><td>27.1%</td><td>27.6%</td><td>27.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td><td>0.4%</td><td>0.4%</td><td>0.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Two or More Races</td><td>7.0%</td><td>10.8%</td><td>10.2%</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>59.9%</td><td>55.9%</td><td>55.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Unknown</td><td>3.1%</td><td>2.4%</td><td>3.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Actual Sample Size</td><td>6514</td><td>6880</td><td>7100</td></tr></table> <p><b>Reliability:</b> Data from the pilot were used to examine the reliability and validity of the three versions of the instrument - elementary, middle, and high school students. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, with values of .7 and above representing adequate internal consistency (see Table 2). The Student Engagement Surveys results for the Middle and High School student groups fall within the “good” range for reliability. The exception in this case is the Elementary student group for which the reliability was found to be closer to “adequate”. It is theorized that drop in reliability may actually be a byproduct of the respondents’ ages and cognitive developmental level as opposed to survey content. All three groups received survey questions that are similar in content with some differentiation among groups (©AdvancED Education Inc., 2017).</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">Table 2. Reliability of Student Engagement Surveys.</th></tr><tr><th>Group</th><th>Reliability</th></tr><tr><td>High School</td><td>0.80</td></tr><tr><td>Middle School</td><td>0.80</td></tr><tr><td>Elementary School</td><td>0.67</td></tr></table> <p><b>Validity:</b> Construct validity was examined using confirmatory factor analysis. Table 3 shows the results of the CFA across several common fit indices. All values in Table 3 represent good fit of the data to the model across all of the fit indices. “Good” is defined as Root Mean Square Residual (RMSR) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) less than 0.05 and Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Normed Fit Index (NFI) between 0.90 and 0.95 (©AdvancEd Education, Inc., 2017).</p> <table><tr><th colspan="6">Table 3. Three Factor Fit Indices for Student Engagement Surveys.</th></tr><tr><th>Group</th><th>RMSR</th><th>RMSEA</th><th>GFI</th><th>CFI</th><th>NFI</th></tr><tr><td>High School</td><td>0.0132</td><td>0.0339</td><td>0.9795</td><td>0.9420</td><td>0.9341</td></tr><tr><td>Middle School</td><td>0.0133</td><td>0.0342</td><td>0.9770</td><td>0.9385</td><td>0.9341</td></tr><tr><td>Elementary School</td><td>0.0095</td><td>0.0259</td><td>0.9860</td><td>0.9422</td><td>0.9311</td></tr></table>	Table 1. Sample Size of the Pilot Study with Race Percentages by Groups				Race/Ethnicity	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	American Indian or Alaska Native	1.0%	2.0%	2.7%	Asian	1.5%	0.9%	0.9%	Black or African American	27.1%	27.6%	27.1%	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	Two or More Races	7.0%	10.8%	10.2%	White	59.9%	55.9%	55.2%	Unknown	3.1%	2.4%	3.3%	Actual Sample Size	6514	6880	7100	Table 2. Reliability of Student Engagement Surveys.		Group	Reliability	High School	0.80	Middle School	0.80	Elementary School	0.67	Table 3. Three Factor Fit Indices for Student Engagement Surveys.						Group	RMSR	RMSEA	GFI	CFI	NFI	High School	0.0132	0.0339	0.9795	0.9420	0.9341	Middle School	0.0133	0.0342	0.9770	0.9385	0.9341	Elementary School	0.0095	0.0259	0.9860	0.9422	0.9311
Table 1. Sample Size of the Pilot Study with Race Percentages by Groups																																																																																	
Race/Ethnicity	High School	Middle School	Elementary School																																																																														
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.0%	2.0%	2.7%																																																																														
Asian	1.5%	0.9%	0.9%																																																																														
Black or African American	27.1%	27.6%	27.1%																																																																														
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%																																																																														
Two or More Races	7.0%	10.8%	10.2%																																																																														
White	59.9%	55.9%	55.2%																																																																														
Unknown	3.1%	2.4%	3.3%																																																																														
Actual Sample Size	6514	6880	7100																																																																														
Table 2. Reliability of Student Engagement Surveys.																																																																																	
Group	Reliability																																																																																
High School	0.80																																																																																
Middle School	0.80																																																																																
Elementary School	0.67																																																																																
Table 3. Three Factor Fit Indices for Student Engagement Surveys.																																																																																	
Group	RMSR	RMSEA	GFI	CFI	NFI																																																																												
High School	0.0132	0.0339	0.9795	0.9420	0.9341																																																																												
Middle School	0.0133	0.0342	0.9770	0.9385	0.9341																																																																												
Elementary School	0.0095	0.0259	0.9860	0.9422	0.9311																																																																												



Indicator	Details
	<u>Analysis:</u> Each individual item was reviewed using a Rasch analysis, utilizing several fit indices to determine how well the items performed. Across all three SES forms, 3 items on the high school form, 3 items from the middle school form, and 1 item from the elementary form were considered "on bounds" meaning their values were close to the threshold values used to determine item fit. All other items were within commonly accepted parameters and considered to be functioning exceptionally well within the confines of the instrument.

### Effective Learning Environment Indicator Points

Total Points: 10                      Elementary and Middle Schools

Total Points: 5                      High Schools

How Points Are Earned: South Carolina ~~is considering two possible methods for distributing points~~ will award points for percentage of students who are "committed" averaged cross the three domains. The percentage will be multiplied by the weight of the category (10 = Elementary and Middle and 5 = High school).

**~~Option 1: South Carolina Schools v. National Benchmarks.~~** If a survey instrument is selected that includes national benchmark data, the student engagement survey results from schools in South Carolina could be compared to the national level. Schools at or above the national level would earn disproportionately more points.

**~~Option 2: Divide the state results into quintiles or deciles and award points accordingly.~~**

#### Students Included in the Rating:

Students enrolled at the 90th day in grades 3–12.

Students taking Alt-Assessments may be excluded per the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team decision.

#### Steps to Create the *Effective Learning Environment* Indicator:

1. Average the percentage of students in the "Committed" category for behavior, cognitive, and emotional domains.
2. Multiply the average expressed by a decimal by the weight of the category (10 or 5) to determine the points earned.

#### Effective Learning Environment Summative Rating:

The ELP summative rating will be reported on five levels: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory. See Table 31 below for the points in each rating.

**Table 31: Sample of decile report by Indicator Performance level**

Rating	State Percentile	Points Earned Out of 10	Points Earned Out of 5.0	Points Earned Out of 20
Excellent	Above 95th	10	5.0	20
	90th to 95th	9	4.5	18
Good	80th	8	4.0	16
	70th	7	3.5	14
Average	60th	6	3.0	12
	50th	5	2.5	10

Rating	State Percentile	Points Earned Out of 10	Points Earned Out of 5.0	Points Earned Out of 20
Below Average	40th	4	2.0	8
	30th	3	1.5	6
Unsatisfactory	20th	2	1.0	4
	10th	1	.5	2

*Data may be added after survey procurement and administration in 2018.*

- v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))
- a. Describe the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State's accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

For all schools with traditional populations and grades (including all charter schools): South Carolina will calculate a

- summative rating for each leading indicator, and
- summative rating based upon the aggregate points earned across all indicators applied through the weighted point index.  
*See School Performance Indicators Weighted Point Index below.*

**School Performance Indicators Weighted Point Index: EL n-size of 20**

Indicator	Elementary	Middle	High
Achievement ELA and Mathematics	35 points	35 points	25 points
Growth 50% All Students 50% Bottom Quintile	35 points	35 points	NA
English Language Proficiency	10 points	10 points	10 points
Graduation Rate	NA	NA	25 points
Preparing for Success Science and Social Studies	10 points	10 points	10 points
College and Career Readiness	NA	NA	25 points
Positive & Effective Learning Environment	10 points	10 points	5 points
Total	100 points	100 points	100 points



**School Performance Indicators Weighted Point Index: EL n-size < 20**

Indicator	Elementary	Middle	High
Achievement ELA and Mathematics	40 points	40 points	30 points
Growth 50% All Students 50% Bottom Quintile	40 points	40 points	NA
English Language Proficiency	0 points	0 points	0 points
Graduation Rate	NA	NA	30 points
Preparing for Success Science and Social Studies	10 points	10 points	10 points
College and Career Readiness	NA	NA	25 points



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>
Positive & Effective Learning Environment	10 points	10 points	5 points
Total	100 points	100 points	100 points

- b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

### Elementary and Middle Schools

80% Academic Indicators	20% School Quality/Student Success Indicators
	

### High Schools

60% Academic Indicators	40% School Quality/Student Success
	

### Final Summative Determinations:

South Carolina will use aggregate all point system for each of the leading indicators for school to determine a final summative point total using a weighted point index. All points are rounded to the nearest hundredth. A final summative rating will be awarded for performance on each leading indicator by level. The performance levels are as follows:

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress
- Below Average – School performance is below the standard for progress
- Unsatisfactory – School performance fails to meet the standard for progress

The following student National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (NAEP) information was used by the EOC as justification for the percentage distribution of schools under the accountability model.

<b>South Carolina 2015 NAEP</b>	<b>Final Summative Rating Percentages</b>
25 – 37% Proficient & Advanced	15% – Excellent 20% – Good
31 – 44% Basic	35% – Average
21 – 35% Below Basic	20% – Below Average 10% – Unsatisfactory

- c. If the States uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), describe the different methodology or methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

### **Grade Spans**

A typical elementary school is defined as containing kindergarten through grade five, a typical middle school, grades six through eight, and a typical high school, grades nine through twelve.

Any school that includes one grade on either side of the typical pattern will be viewed as part of that organizational pattern. For example, if a school includes kindergarten through grade six, it will be considered an elementary school and receive one rating. If a school includes grades five through nine, it will be considered a middle school and receive one rating.

If a school includes two or more grades on either side of the typical pattern (e.g., grades four through eight), two report cards will be produced. Due to the differences in data included in ratings for high school grades, any school that contains grade ten and crosses organizational patterns will receive at least two report cards.

Examples in South Carolina include:

<b>Grade Span</b>	<b>Report Cards</b>
PK)–5	Elementary only
PK–8	Elementary and middle school report cards
PK–6	Elementary only
PK–7	Elementary and middle
Gr 7–9 or Gr 7–10	Middle school only (Report (only) annual high school metrics as applicable. High School Metrics will not be used in the school accountability rating.)
Grade 9–12	High school only
Grade 7–12	Middle and high school report cards
Grade 9 or Grade 9–10	Use rating for high school feeder school (if one high school) and report (only) high school metrics as applicable.

South Carolina will have **supplemental** accountability report cards that differ from the traditional school report cards for **schools that do not administer required federal summative assessments or whose student populations dictate that different measures should be included**. The supplemental report cards are designed by the Education Oversight Committee and reported annually.

- a. **Schools/Programs without a Weighted Point Index:** The following schools will be excluded from annual meaningful differentiation outlined in State's ESSA plan.

**Primary Schools Pre-Kindergarten (PK)-2** – Schools with any combination of grade spans between PK – 2 only. These PK-2 schools do not administer the required federal summative assessments for grades 3-high school, and therefore, do not have comparable data sources to calculate a weighted point index that matches the achievement, growth, student success metric (science and social studies *Preparing for Success*), or school quality metric (student engagement survey) of traditional elementary schools.

**CATE Centers** – Programs designed for vocational studies that are housed in stand-alone facilities or in comprehensive high schools. Students attending CATE programs remain enrolled in their home high school and only visit the CATE programs for specific courses. These centers may have a distinct report card beginning in 2019 with metrics outlined by the EOC; however, they do not administer federally required assessments that apply to metrics outlined in ESSA. Students attending CATE programs are included in accountability metrics in home high schools.

**Palmetto Unified** – This program serves incarcerated adults aged 17 or older in an Adult Education model using curriculum aligned to the G.E.D. As such, these students are not pursuing a high school diploma; are not enrolled in courses eligible for the Achievement metric (English 1 and Algebra 1); are not enrolled in courses eligible for the Preparing for Success metric (Biology 1 and U.S. History); are not included in the in the comparable College or Career readiness metrics; and may only take ACCESS testing for English Learners toward English Proficiency if needed.

- b. **Schools outside SCDE Jurisdiction:** The following schools operate outside of the jurisdiction of the South Carolina Department of Education as prescribed by state law and are excluded from the annual meaningful differentiation of schools required by ESSA.

**Will Lou Grey** – An opportunity school that focuses on vocational rehabilitation, personal and social adjustment, and pre-vocation and vocational courses for persons with disabilities. This school is not on the public school list and not governed by the State Superintendent of Education. South Carolina of Laws indicates that “the director shall

make all rules and regulations for the governance of the school” {59-51-50}.

- c. **Schools with an Adjusted Weighted Point Index:** The following schools will be included in the ESSA annual meaningful differentiation of schools but will have a differentiated weighted point index based upon their special population or special grade configuration:

Primary Schools PK-3 – Schools that include any combination of grades PK-3. These schools have only one federally required tested grade (Grade 3 ELA and mathematics); therefore, the weighted point index for these schools would include an Achievement index (80%) and a School Quality index using the student engagement survey (20%) to produce a summative weighted point index. The growth metric is excluded because it requires a grade 3 and grade 4 at a minimum. The student success metric is eliminated because South Carolina tests science and social studies in grades 4 and 5 respectively. South Carolina law (*Education Accountability Act 1999*) does allow for primary school report cards to include formative assessments. Therefore, in 2019, the Education Oversight Committee may introduce other ELA and mathematics formative assessment measures that could be included in a new weighted point index for primary schools. If these changes are approved by the EOC, a new weighted point index that spans PK-3 may be submitted to the USED for approval.

Identification for comprehensive support and intervention and targeted support and intervention will follow the same model for all elementary schools using the weighted point index across all applicable metrics.


- d. **Special Schools that will include same ESSA accountability metrics:** The following schools will be included in the annual meaningful differentiation of schools for the purposes outlined in ESSA using the same accountability metrics for similar grade spans (elementary, middle, high). These schools function independently of an LEA and will be included independently in the grade bands most applicable (Elementary, Middle, or High School). (*See Appendix F for state specific elements*):
- School for Deaf and Blind
  - Birchwood School of Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)
  - Governor’s School for Mathematics and Science
  - Governor’s School for the Arts

~~Additional metrics for these schools are being developed by the Education Oversight Committee and are reported annually with the federal report card ratings.~~

Identification for comprehensive support and intervention and targeted support and intervention will follow the same model for all elementary, middle, and high schools using the weighted point index across all applicable metrics on the federal report card.

**Other Reported Elements on the ESSA Report Card: (not included in weighted point index:**

The SCDE and EOC are co-developing prototype report cards for new schools, LEAs, and the state. Extensive stakeholder involvement was solicited from schools, parents, and businesses on how the state should present the new accountability metrics and state and federal reporting requirements. A sample landing page prototype for a school level report card is presented below. Additionally, Appendix G lists all the reporting requirements South Carolina will seek to include beginning in 2018 for information required under federal and state law. Optional items listed in Appendix G will be phased in beginning in 2019.



vi.

**Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))**

- Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for CSI, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.



The state will use the designations “priority schools” and “CSI schools.” Priority Schools are defined as schools that need support because they meet one or more of the following categories:

- Title I schools in the bottom ten (10) percent using the weighted point index; or
- Non-Title I schools differentiated by elementary, middle, and high school in the bottom ten percent using the weighted point index; or
- Less than 70 percent graduation rate; or
- Title I Schools with chronically low-performing subgroup(s).

Comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools are Title I schools in the bottom five (5) percent using the weighted point index or schools with a graduation rate of less than 70 percent. Subject to funding additional support will also be provided to priority schools using the State’s tiered support matrix.

- b. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for CSI, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Both Title I and Non-Title I high schools will be identified as CSI Schools if their four year cohort graduation rate is less than 70 percent. High schools (both Title I and Non-Title I) performing in the bottom ten percent on the weighted point index will also be identified as “priority schools.” Title I high schools performing in the bottom five percent will be identified as CSI schools.

- c. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Title I schools identified for **additional** targeted support and improvement (ATSI) due to low performing subgroups **who have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools** ~~who do not demonstrate improvement after six years or two cycles aligned with the three-year state interim targets,~~ will be identified as CSI schools due to chronically low performing subgroups. **Chronic Schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement due to** low performing subgroups **who have not met the exit criteria for such** are defined in the following manner: Schools with **one or more** subgroups ~~which are~~ performing as low as ALL students in the highest performing CSI schools **across all indicators for six years, which is the equivalent of in the bottom 5 percent in graduation rate, college and career readiness,**

~~and student engagement~~ for two consecutive identification cycles. These schools will be initially identified for CSI in 2020 as TSI identification for low performing subgroups will occur in 2018, and a second designation would occur in 2020 aligned with interim targets, which would trigger the CSI designation.

- d. Frequency of Identification. Provide, for each type of school identified for CSI, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

Priority and CSI Schools will be identified every three years. The baseline will be 2017 results and schools will enter their planning year (2017-18). In the first cycle, the CSI designation will apply for two additional years (2018-19 and 2019-20). Beginning in 2020, these cycles will align with the interim target dates, and the comprehensive and support criteria may apply a three-year average methodology to calculate the bottom ten percent in achievement, growth/graduation rate, and ELP.

- e. Targeted Support and Improvement. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii)*).

Consistently Underperforming Definition: Schools with one or more ~~historically underperforming~~ **accountability** subgroups performing at or below the bottom 10 percent of schools across all accountability ~~measures~~ **indicators** for three consecutive years. ~~across all indicators~~. **Accountability subgroups are those subgroups as defined in section 1111(c) (2).**

Underperforming Subgroups: Schools with underperforming **accountability** subgroups will be identified annually. **The state will define underperforming accountability subgroups as schools with one or more subgroups performing in the bottom 10 percent of schools across all accountability indicators.** ~~Underperforming subgroups are those historically under-achieving groups who are performing in the bottom 10 percent across all accountability metrics. Three consecutive years of being identified as having an~~ **for an "underperforming accountability subgroup" will cause a school to be identified as a** ~~Receive the designation of a~~ **Targeted Support and Improvement School.** ~~, because the subgroup(s) have demonstrated that they are "consistently underperforming" and are in danger of dropping to the bottom 5 percent designation of low performing subgroups. In November of 2018, the state will make initial identification of schools with "underperforming accountability subgroups." The first focus school designation for "consistently underperforming accountability subgroups" will occur in November 2020 based on data through Spring~~

2020. Thereafter, the state will use a three year average, to include the current year and the prior two year values in order to determine identification of consistently underperforming accountability subgroups. Thereafter, three-year rolling average of the points earned on the individual metrics will be used to compare to the all students metrics in the bottom 10 percent of schools. Consistently underperforming subgroups identification cycles will align with the interim target dates.

- f. Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State’s methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (*ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)*)

The State Education Agency (SEA) will identify schools for Additional Targeted Support if one or more subgroups of students on its own would lead to identification under ESEA due to Low Performing Subgroups based on the following definition: The SCDE will identify schools in which any subgroup which one or more subgroups of students on its own would lead to identification under ESEA using the state’s methodology for identifying low-performing subgroups: any school in which one or more subgroups of students is performing at or below the performance of all students in the highest performing 5 percent of CSI across all accountability indicators. schools in achievement, growth, preparing for success, graduation rate, college and career readiness, and positive and effective learning environment.

Schools with low-performing subgroups will be identified every three years on the state’s interim target cycle. Additional funding and support will be provided each year that a school has one or more subgroups identified as “low performing.” Initial designation of Additional Targeted Support and Intervention (ATSI) will occur in November 20187 and the ATSI designation will apply for three years. . A second consecutive designation of ATSI will trigger a change in the subgroup label from “low performing” to “chronically low-performing” which also changes the designation from ATSI to CSI (as explained in Subsection C above).

Schools with low-performing subgroups will be identified every three years on the state’s interim target cycle. Additional funding and support will be provided each year that a school has one or more subgroups identified as “low performing.” Initial designation of Additional Targeted Support and Intervention (ATSI) will occur in November 2017 and the ATSI designation will apply for three years. . A second consecutive designation of ATSI will trigger a change in the subgroup label from “low-performing” to “chronically low-

performing” which also changes the designation from ATSI to CSI (as explained in Subsection C above).

- g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

South Carolina does not choose to include statewide categories of schools beyond CSI, ATSI, and TSI Schools.

- vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)*): Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Schools that do not have 95 percent of students participating in state testing for mathematics, reading/language arts, and federally required grades for science:

- May not receive the highest rating in achievement or in the summative rating.
- Must develop a plan monitored by the SCDE to test 95 percent.
- Will have a zero (0) factored into the achievement rating for all students and subjects not tested.
- May have Title I funds reduced if the problem persists for more than one year.

- viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (*ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)*)

- a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for CSI, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

An elementary or middle school could exit CSI status upon achieving **either of** the following:

1. A final summative score on weighted point index that is above the bottom five percent of Title I and non-Title I schools and a growth rating of “Good”; or
2. The identified subgroup(s) performance moves above the performance of ALL students in the highest performing Title I CSI school in **achievement, preparing for success, graduation rate, college and career readiness**, and student engagement and a growth rating of “Good.”

A high school could exit CSI status upon **meeting any of** achieving the following **options**:

1. A final summative score on weighted point index that is above the bottom five percent of Title I schools and non-Title I schools and a three percent increase in the school’s average number of points earned in the college and career readiness indicator; **or**

2. A graduation rate that is 70 percent or higher; and a three percent increase in the school's average number of points earned in the college and career readiness indicator; **or**
3. The identified subgroup(s) performance moves above the performance of ALL students in the highest performing Title I CSI school in achievement, growth, preparing for success, graduation rate, college and career readiness, and positive and effective learning environment and increase by three percent in the school's average number of points earned in the college and career readiness indicator.

The baseline will be 2017 results and schools will enter their planning year. The CSI designation will apply for two additional years from 2018–20. Beginning in 2020, the comprehensive and support criteria may apply a three-year average methodology to calculating the bottom five percent. ~~across in achievement, growth/graduation rate, and ELP.~~

- b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

~~South Carolina will exit a school from additional targeted support school status in the following manner:~~

Elementary and Middle Schools **may with low performing subgroups will exit from additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) by meeting the following criteria:**

- ~~when~~ the identified subgroup(s)' **average** performance moves above the ALL students' **average** performance in the bottom five percent of the highest performing Title I or non-Title I schools identified for CSI in achievement and growth.

High Schools **may exit from additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) by meeting the following criteria:**

- ~~with low performing subgroups will exit TSI when~~ the identified subgroup(s)' performance moves above the ALL student's **average** performance in the bottom five percent of the Title I or non-Title I schools in CSI in achievement and college and career readiness.

**Concurrent with the state's interim targets, schools are expected to meet the exit criteria within three years of being identified for additional targeted support and improvement. When calculating average performance, the state will utilize the current year (identification year) value and the values from the subsequent two years.**

~~Consistently Underperforming Subgroups:~~

- ~~Elementary and Middle Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups will exit TSI when the identified subgroup(s)' three-year average performance is above the three-year average performance of ALL students in the highest performing school in the bottom five percent in achievement and growth.~~
  - ~~High Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups will exit TSI when the identified subgroup(s)' three-year average performance is above the three-year average performance of ALL students in the highest performing school in the bottom five percent in achievement and college and career readiness.~~
- c. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

Schools identified for CSI that fail to meet the state's exit criteria within three years will be required to amend their School Renewal Plans to include evidence-based interventions based on the four levels required by ESSA, (strong, moderate, basic, rationale) and the South Carolina Tiered Support and Intervention Matrix. Schools that fail to improve within three years will be required to select intervention strategies and practices that meet the moderate or strong level. Tier levels are derived from four key elements for each school:

1. Academic achievement ranking among all low-performing schools,
2. Length of time the school has been identified as low performing,
3. Accreditation designation-compliance with state statutes related to teachers teaching in the areas for which they are certified, and
4. Financial Risk Status- based on the South Carolina's new law on fiscal practices § 59-20-90 and applicable parts of the Uniform Grant Guidance (UGG) ( in 2 CFR Part 200, which requires the state to annually assess the risk status of subgrantees.

Based on these factors, schools are assigned a particular tier, with Tier 1 being the lowest level of support and intervention and Tier 4 being the highest level of support and intervention, as indicated in the South Carolina Tiered Support and Intervention Matrix.

Using the South Carolina Tiered Support and Intervention Matrix, school improvement teams should select an appropriate, evidence-based intervention or strategy that aligns with the school's designated tier. The Tiered Support and Intervention Matrix should be viewed as a minimum requirement. Selecting an evidence-based intervention practice that meets the highest level of evidence is encouraged for all schools, regardless of tier level. Transformation Coaches will monitor the fidelity of implementation for each selected strategy on a weekly, monthly, quarterly, or routine basis relative to each tier. Schools will utilize the matrix to determine tier and the required level of evidence based on their assigned tier. Please reference the matrix below:



<b>South Carolina Tiered Support and Intervention Matrix</b>				
	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Tier 3</b>	<b>Tier 4</b>
<b>School Improvement Planning</b>	School Renewal Planning- strategies closely aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored routinely by Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning- strategies closely aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored by quarterly Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning- strategies closely aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored by monthly Transformation Coach	School Renewal Planning- strategies mutually agreed upon by SCDE and school/district and aligned with diagnostic review improvement priorities; monitored at least weekly by Transformation Coach
<b>Selection of Evidence Based Interventions &amp; Technical Assistance Funds (TA funds)</b>	Autonomy to select strategies for improvement and use of TA funds	Mild guidance to select strategies for improvement and use of TA funds	Strong guidance to select strategies for improvement and use of TA funds	SCDE direct/control selection of strategies for improvement and use of TA funds
<b>Evidence-Based Intervention Strategies Tier Requirements</b>	Evidence-based strategies must be at "rationale level" at a minimum (positive evaluation that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes) with ongoing examination of efforts	Evidence-based intervention at "promising level" at a minimum with a correlational or quasi-experimental study to demonstrate statistically significant effect on student outcomes	Evidence-based interventions must be at "moderate level" at a minimum and demonstrate statistically significant effect on student outcomes	Evidence-based interventions must be at "strong level" with a randomized control group or at "moderate level" at a minimum and demonstrate statistically significant effect on student outcomes

- d. Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

The SCDE will periodically review, identify, and address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the state serving a significant number of schools identified for CSI or TSI, or as priority schools, in a variety of ways. After the first cycle, every three years, in concert with the three-year interim target periods, the SCDE will also review resource allocations to support school improvement and to analyze the measurable impact of resource allocations on student learning outcomes, fiscal accountability, and program review processes for these LEAs, as compared with LEAs without a significant number or



percentage of schools identified for CSI or TSI. To do this, the SCDE will conduct a needs assessment (every three years) that also addresses resource inequity. This assessment will include an examination of the allocation and use of resources; the equity of resource distribution to need; the ability of the LEA to ensure appropriate levels of funding and sustainability of resources; and evidence of long-range capital and resource planning effectiveness. This assessment will look at the following types of resources:

1. Personnel–All staff members are qualified and sufficient in number to fulfill their roles and responsibilities and support the school’s educational program.
  2. Instructional time, material resources, and fiscal resources are sufficient to support school improvement.
  3. School facilities, services, and equipment are maintained and support a safe environment for all stakeholders.
  4. Stakeholders have appropriate and adequate access to information and resources to support school improvement.
  5. The technology infrastructure supports the school’s improvement efforts.
  6. Appropriate support services are provided to meet the needs of students. School services support the counseling, assessment, referral, educational, and career planning functions for all students.
- e. Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

An LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for CSI or TSI will be provided with the following technical assistance:

1. Diagnostic System/LEA Review (Planning/Identification Year and Year 3); Governance and Leadership Capacity Review (Planning/Identification Year and Year 3);
2. Revision of district renewal/strategic plan goals and objectives based upon diagnostic review and leadership capacity review; SCDE and contracted services for professional development (PD) based upon Diagnostic System Review (improvement priorities);
3. SCDE support to improve financial risk or accreditation status as needed;
4. An SEA appointed support liaison to serve the district and schools;
5. Evaluation of results annually on district renewal/strategic plan targets to determine effectiveness of interventions on student growth and achievement, along with a comprehensive review of interim targets met for ALL students and for subgroups in achievement and graduation rate; and
6. SCDE guidance regarding the selection of evidence-based practices and interventions to improve summative ratings for all applicable leading indicators (achievement, growth, ELP,

graduation rate). The following state-approved list of evidence based resources may be used:

- What Works Clearinghouse
- Evidence For ESSA
- Results First Clearinghouse Database
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia
- The Center on Instruction
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement
- Roadmap to Evidence Based Reform for Low Graduation Rate High Schools
- RAND report on school leadership interventions under ESSA
- Using Evidence to Create Next Generation High Schools

Technical assistance for CSI schools will be budgeted from state funds administered by the SCDE's Office of School Transformation and allocated based upon evidence of needs from the diagnostic review, financial risk status, accreditation status, and PD needs, along with a consideration of the school's size and capacity and their tier ranking. Schools identified for CSI will receive technical assistance funds (TA funds) to support their improvement efforts annually. Title I CSI schools will receive additional TA funds to supplement state and local funds and support their improvement efforts annually. Five percent of state TA funds will be allocated to the Office of School Transformation to support statewide improvement initiatives and PD. Ten percent of state TA funds will be allocated by the Office of School Transformation for "special projects" to assist LEAs/schools in the lowest accountability rating with improvement initiatives tied to their needs assessments. Seven percent of state Title I funds will be set aside to support schools in TSI. Funds will be allocated to TSI schools proportionally, based on the numbers of identified schools and students relative to the amount of state set-aside funds.

- f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for CSI and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

The SCDE will annually evaluate the results of district/strategic and school/renewal plan targets to determine effectiveness of interventions on student growth and achievement, along with a comprehensive review of interim targets met for ALL students and for subgroups in achievement and graduation rate. LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing TSI plans may be eligible for special project technical assistance numbering to support their improvement efforts. This technical assistance could be any of the following:

- Support from various SCDE offices as they relate to the TSI school's needs
  - Professional learning opportunities (PLOs) designed and provided by various SCDE offices.
5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)*): Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.<sup>4</sup>

The SCDE is committed to ensuring that all students in South Carolina are taught by teachers who are effective, in-field, and experienced. To determine how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, the SCDE has defined those terms for South Carolina as the following:

- A teacher is defined as any instructor who has been assigned students in a school's or district's student information system for any period during a given school year. Included are teachers of record, virtual teachers, intervention providers, coaches, counselors, media specialists, or other professionals who have direct contact with students.
- An ineffective teacher is defined as a teacher on an annual or continuing contract who has received a Not Met rating for one year OR a teacher on an induction contract who has received a Not Met rating for a second year. Prior to implementation of a new four-level teacher evaluation system in 2018–19, the SCDE will determine which levels will constitute a Not Met rating for future reporting.
- An out-of-field teacher is defined as a teacher who is teaching one or more courses or classes in a subject for which he/she does not have the appropriate certification. In South Carolina, a teacher has the appropriate certification if he/she has a certificate in the area or a certification permit in the area.
- An inexperienced teacher is defined as a teacher who has three or fewer years of teaching experience as indicated on his/her South Carolina license. In South Carolina, districts may keep their teachers on induction contracts for up to three years.

Using these definitions, the SCDE will publish minimum standards for reporting teacher data that will apply to all South Carolina public schools and districts, particularly those with Title I schools. These standards will ensure a baseline of comparable, accurate, and transparent reporting from all schools and districts in the state.

Baseline student-level data for the 2016–17 school year are provided in Appendix E. While some disproportionality exists within Title I schools, the SCDE is also committed to supporting district work to reduce disproportionality in all schools in South Carolina. This disproportionality was first examined and addressed by the South Carolina State Plan for Equitable Distribution of Excellent Educators (State Equity Plan), approved by the USED in September 2015 based on 2013–14 school year data. Since then, the SCDE has successfully completed all of the strategies outlined in its 2015 plan. Most of the State Equity Plan strategies were designed to delve more deeply into the root causes of

---

<sup>4</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

factors affecting teacher recruitment and retention; this information will continue to inform SCDE strategies with schools and districts moving forward as the agency works with districts to reduce disproportionalities both across schools and for low-income and minority students enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A.

Under ESSA, beginning in the fall of 2018, the Office of Federal and State Accountability, with support from the Office of Research and Data Analysis, will publish an annual report, called the Access to Educators Report, detailing the yearly progress of the state in ensuring that all students – particularly low-income and minority students enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A – are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. The report will contain that year's data aggregated across three levels, progress compared to previous years' data, evaluation of strategies implemented by the SCDE that year, and plans for future SCDE strategies based on data analysis and evaluation. The report will be made public on the SCDE website at <http://ed.sc.gov/data/reports>.

~~Measures central to the SCDE's annual Access to Educators Report will center around the disproportionality at three levels: 1) within schools served under Title I, Part A; 2) between Title I and non Title I schools; and 3) across all South Carolina schools. At each level, focus will be on the rate at which low income and minority students are taught by ineffective, out of field, or inexperienced teachers. Change in rates of disproportionality over time will be examined at each level.~~

At minimum, measures central to the SCDE's annual Access to Educators Report will focus on disproportionality within schools served under Title I, Part A. Percentages of students taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers in the core subjects of ELA, math, or science will be compared between low-income students and non-low-income students enrolled in Title I, Part A schools as well as minority and non-minority enrolled in Title I, Part A schools. Changes in rates of disproportionality over time will be examined.

As part of its work with the State Equity Plan, the SCDE has instituted a multi-agency State Human Capital Team and is working with the grant-funded State Human Capital Alliance to finalize state-level strategies to be implemented beginning in 2018–19. This work is a joint effort between the SCDE and other state agencies including the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA), and is based on the root causes of disproportionate rates established during the development and implementation of the State Equity Plan. The goal of the State Human Capital Team is to ensure low-income and minority children across schools in South Carolina are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. Title I, Part A funds may be used at the state level to support the development or implementation of strategies by the State Human Capital Team.

Districts with Title I schools that show significant discrepancies will be notified and targeted for support by the SCDE's Office of Federal and State Accountability Title I program, with the assistance of the State Human Capital Team, to address the discrepancies as part of the districts' strategic plans, school renewal plans, and Title I plans. This requirement will include a needs assessment that identifies root causes for the disproportionalities within the Title I schools. The district will be required to include in its plan specific strategies and objectives to address their identified root causes. To support the plan development, the SCDE may provide PD and technical assistance for

principals, school counselors, and others in schools who assign students to course sections to minimize within-school disproportionality.

6. School Conditions (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)): Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

☐ No.

South Carolina has activities and requirements in place to reduce incidents of bullying and harassment, the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

South Carolina's Safe School Climate Act (S.C. Code Ann. § 59-63-110, *et seq.*) requires each district to adopt an anti-bullying policy and encourages all districts to implement anti-bullying initiatives. To provide districts representatives with information about various anti-bully strategies, the SCDE, in collaboration with the U.S. Attorney's Office, has been sponsoring an Anti-Bullying Summit annually. During the Summit, bullying experts provide anti-bullying strategies for victims and bullies. Furthermore, students are asked to develop plans to bring awareness to, and subsequently reduce, bullying in their respective schools. In December 2016, approximately 1,000 students and school leaders, representing more than 25 districts statewide participated in the Anti-Bullying Summit.

The SCDE has been collaborating annually with the U. S. Attorney's Office, the S.C. Law Enforcement Association, and the S.C. Law Enforcement Division to sponsor the *Law Enforcement and Schools: A Partnership for Safe Schools* regional seminars. To increase participation statewide, the seminars are held in the following counties: Richland, Charleston, Florence, and Greenville. During the 2016 seminars, one of the main presenters discussed cultural sensitivity and various methods of proactively addressing the behavioral/functional needs of students with disabilities and special needs. Approximately 300 educators and law enforcement officials participated in the seminars.

South Carolina's alternative school law (S.C. Code Ann. § 59-63-1300) encourages districts to establish alternative school programs for students who for behavioral or academic reasons are not benefitting from the regular school program or may be interfering with the learning of others. All districts receive funding through the Education Improvement Act (EIA) to operate alternative school programs. With few exceptions, the majority of the 6,842 students enrolled in alternative school programs during 2016–17 would have been expelled if such programs did not exist. Of the number enrolled, 416 earned a state high school diploma and 2,793 were promoted to the next grade level. Additionally, training related to classroom management and positive behavior interventions is provided several times each year to alternative school program educators.

In the alternative school programs, professional learning is provided to educators in classroom management, behavioral intervention strategies, strategies for working with at risk students, and enhancing the use of technology in the classroom.

In 2009, the SCDE created a CyberSafety Task Force to develop a public awareness program on Internet safety and design, develop, produce, and distribute instructional materials and programs for classroom teachers and administrators. These Internet Safety Standards are the basis for this public awareness program and can be found at the following website:

<http://www.ed.sc.gov/districts-schools/school-safety/internet-safety/internet-safety-standards/>.

In addition to these strategies to improve school conditions for student learning, the SCDE provides School Resource Officers (SROs) with training on classroom management, positive intervention, cultural diversity, de-escalation, and non-violent crisis intervention.

In November 2015, State Superintendent of Education Molly M. Spearman established the Safe Schools Taskforce to examine school policies and educator and law enforcement training criteria and making recommendations on best practices to ensure safe school climates throughout the state.

The taskforce recommended the following changes to improve school climate and safety:

- The SCDE shall provide access to best practice, evidence-based interventions for students, teachers, administrators, and SROs. These should be made available online.
- The SCDE recommends the following to be included in the training of SROs: classroom management, positive intervention, cultural diversity, de-escalation, and Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI) training.
- The SCDE shall offer an overview of new discipline regulations along with positive intervention and frameworks to incoming principals during their initial training.
- The SCDE recommends that teachers and principals receive comprehensive training on the progressive behavior plan. Alternative certification requirements should include the same training.

The Taskforce developed a behavioral matrix that includes an emphasis on developing more interventions and restorative justice practices before students are suspended for lower level offenses.

The Education and Economic Development Act of 2005 (EEDA) was passed to ensure that all students, including those who exhibit one or more academic or behavioral traits that place them at-risk of not succeeding in school, are prepared for the next grade level. To address the needs of students at risk of failing, schools are required to implement evidence-based strategies or models designed to alleviate any identified deficiencies. To assist schools in implementing or continuing evidence-based programs, the SCDE awards, through a competitive grant process, up to \$4 million annually to districts. Schools/school districts compete for funding by submitting an application in response to the Preparing College- and Career-Ready Graduates request for proposals. The application outlines the specific needs of the students to be served, along with models, strategies, and activities that will be implemented to assist students in overcoming identified barriers. Ultimately, the goal of EEDA funds is to assist schools in helping to transform students into citizens who have the skills, knowledge, and abilities to compete in a global society.

The EEDA programs take on various forms to deal with the different needs of students from around the state. Districts can apply to provide activities including college-university visits for students, additional academic assistance, recovery of class credits, and hands-on technology projects. As activities to remedy behavioral issues, schools can provide mentors, one-on-one counseling sessions, and classes on conflict resolution. Programs for parents may also be included, such as parent-child conflict resolution, literacy education, and financial counseling. While at-risk students' issues may be different, these programs attempt a holistic approach to ensure that these students become high school graduates prepared for the 21st-century workforce.

7. School Transitions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D)*): Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

All LEAs receive assistance under Title I, Part A. The transitions discussed below apply to all Title I funded schools, as well as non-Title I schools.

### **Early Learning**

South Carolina's continuum of support for LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A begins with the investment in the early years of its students. The state legislature funded full-day kindergarten for all five-year-olds more than twenty years ago, and in 2006, funded the Child Development Education Program, a full-day preschool program for at-risk four-year-old children. In 2014, Act 284, the Read to Succeed Act, was created and codified the Child Development Education Program, which was renamed the Child Early Reading Development and Education Program (CDEP). As of 2016–17, the full day CDEP supported approximately 10,500 full-day 4K students in public schools and approximately 2,600 4K students in private child care centers (through South Carolina First Steps to School Readiness (First Steps)). The non-CDEP districts' full- or half-day preschool programs serve over 12,000 students. State EIA funds provide preschool services in the 21 districts that do not receive CDEP funds, and most of these districts supplement this funding with local funds to offer more access for preschool services. This totals to approximately 25,100 state-funded public and private 4K students. The 2015-16 report by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER.org) listed 23,536 students in state pre-K, 4,901 special education 3K and 4K students, and 10,651 students in federally funded 3K and 4K for a total of 39,088 students, and an estimated 52% of all four-year-olds.

In some LEAs, partnerships with Head Start or First Steps blend funding to provide early childhood programs and services for young children with the common goal of preparing students for transitioning into 5K with the readiness skills and aptitudes needed to be successful.

The state also funds readiness assessments for all 4K and 5K students in publicly funded programs to start early with the building of the bridge for a Pre-K to 3rd grade continuum and to support the transition from Pre-K to 5K and 5K to first grade.

On August 8, 2017, South Carolina updated the Early Learning Standards for children under the age of five. The work on the new Early Learning Standards merged Infant-Toddler Guidelines, developed in 2008 by the South Carolina Department of Social

Services (SCDSS), with the preschool standards (*S.C. Good Start, Grow Smart Standards for 3 – 5 Year Olds*) developed in 2006 through a partnership between the state child care leaders and the SCDE, into one document for a continuum from birth through preschool. The stakeholders who worked to revise the standards represented a wide group of early childhood sectors and state agencies.

To support the new early learning standards, the SCDE Offices of Standards and Learning and Early Learning and Literacy are completing an alignment with the 5K College-and-Career Ready Standards. Following the adoption of the new set of standards in August 2017, the SCDE began a year-long roll-out of professional learning opportunities for early childhood educators across sectors.

### **Guidance and Counseling**

To further assist students as they transition from elementary to middle to high school, the EEDA requires that all schools implement the South Carolina Comprehensive Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program Model (CDGCPM). This model, which provides the framework for a developmentally appropriate guidance and counseling program, provides strategies that school counselors may use to help students better anticipate and adapt to the intellectual, emotional, social, and psychological changes they will encounter as they move through the educational process.

To assist schools in providing more individualized academic, social, and career development support to students as they transition at critical junctures in the educational process, the State provides funds to all districts, specifically to support the salaries and fringe benefits of career specialists to decrease the student-to-guidance personnel ratio in middle and high schools to 300:1. The duties of career specialists are outlined in S.C. Code Ann. § 59-59-105:

1. Coordinate and present PD workshops in career development and guidance for teachers, school counselors, and work based constituents;
2. assist schools in promoting the goals of quality career development of students in kindergarten through twelfth grade;
3. assist school counselors and students in identifying and accessing career information and resource material;
4. provide educators, parents, and students with information on CATE programs offered in the district;
5. support students in the exploration of career clusters and the selection of an area of academic focus within a cluster of study;
6. learn and become familiar with ways to improve and promote career development opportunities within the district;
7. attend continuing education programs on the certified career development facilitator curriculum sponsored by the state;
8. assist with the selection, administration, and evaluation of career interest inventories;
9. assist with the implementation of the district's student career plan or individual graduation plan (IGP);
10. assist schools in planning and developing parent information on career development;
11. coordinate with school counselors and administration on career events, career classes, and career programming;
12. coordinate community resources and citizens representing diverse occupations in career development activities for parents and students; and
13. assist with the usage of computer assisted career guidance systems.



The continuum of support continues through middle school as eighth graders and their parents/guardians meet with school counseling personnel to develop an IGP. The IGP is intended to help students better understand the alignment between their academic course selections and their career aspirations. High school students are provided guidance and curricula that enable them to successfully complete their IGPs, preparing them for a seamless transition to relevant employment, further training, or post-secondary education. High school students continue to receive support and guidance as they develop an IGP that aligns their career goals with their course of study, ensuring that they meet the requirements for graduation including experience-based, career-oriented learning experiences (e.g., internships, apprenticeships, mentoring, co-op education, and service learning). Students may also change their courses of study, but IGPs are sufficiently structured to ensure meeting graduation requirements and admission requirements for post-secondary education.

South Carolina will use Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) funds to enhance the statewide implementation of the EEDA to increase student achievement through rigorous and relevant career and technical education programs at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. The Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council made recommendations to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) regarding course work that is acceptable statewide for dual enrollment. Dual enrollment college courses offered to high school students by two-year and four-year colleges and universities must be equivalent in content and rigor to the equivalent college courses offered to college students and taught by appropriately credentialed faculty. These EEDA components complement the stated purposes and priorities of Perkins IV to ensure that students achieve challenging academic and technical standards and prepare for high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations in current and emerging professions.

### **Programs of Study for all Students**

With the implementation of the EEDA, the SCDE's Office of OCTE identified programs of study and developed templates highlighting seamless pathways from secondary to post-secondary education that could be offered as options to students when planning for and developing their IGPs. These program-of-study templates represent sixteen career clusters and courses aligned with challenging academic standards.

Using the National Center for Education Statistics (NECS) Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes, the fifteen of the EEDA's sixteen secondary clusters were aligned with the post-secondary clusters to determine potential paths of study for all students. Statewide initiatives are in place to foster continued collaboration between secondary and post-secondary institutions to keep the programs of study aligned with post-secondary and the workforce. These are also areas where South Carolina is committed to establishing programs that lead to industry-recognized certificates, diplomas, or associate degrees. The OCTE will continue to improve and expand the CATE courses and programs offered in grades seven through twelve. The secondary CATE courses and programs that are eligible to receive assistance with the Perkins funds are listed and updated annually in the CATE student reporting procedures manual posted on the SCDE website (<https://ed.sc.gov/instruction/career-and-technology-education/>). State-approved CATE courses and programs are organized by career cluster and are assigned course codes and CIP codes to ensure accountability for the uses of the Perkins funds. Perkins funds are used to support a wide range of degree, diploma, and certificate programs at the

post-secondary level. Students may choose to enroll in one of more than 1,000 programs (72 degrees, 25 diplomas, and 1,021 certificates) that are grouped into the following clusters: agriculture, food, and natural resources; architecture and construction; arts, audio-video technology, and communications; business management and administration; education and training; finance; health science; hospitality and tourism; human services – family and consumer sciences; information technology; law, public safety, corrections, and security; manufacturing; marketing; STEM; and transportation, distribution, and logistics. The South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS), college administrators, faculty, and staff will continue to use Perkins funds to support the development of new courses and the enhancement of current program offerings. The OCTE will continue to provide leadership for the development, improvement, and expansion of technology in CATE programs, using both Perkins funds and state funding targeted for these initiatives. CATE programs that receive federal and state funds must be supported by advisory committees with representatives from business and industry to ensure program relevancy to the technological workplace. In addition, the OCTE strongly encourages eligible recipients to seek and obtain national or industry certification for CATE programs, which often requires expanding and improving access to appropriate technology in these programs. All students, school counseling personnel, and educators have access to the South Carolina Occupational Information System (SCOIS), an on-line system that provide users access to specific information about colleges nationwide, occupation wages and forecasts, and financial aid options, along with career assessments and videos. SCOIS also has career-related lesson plans for educators and career guidance tools for parents.

During 2016, SCOIS added or updated several features to create an even more comprehensive system. For example, all career assessments were updated and improved to align with current career trends; a workplace employability skills assessment was added to address soft skills; Financial Football was added to address financial literacy; Career Trek was added to give elementary students additional career exploration and career interest inventory options; Roadtrip Nation was added to connect students virtually to leaders, musicians, artists, and other individuals with similar interests; and College Scorecard was added to provide students easier access to more comprehensive information about individual colleges and universities, including average student debt for current students and average earnings of graduates. Additionally, over 2,000 pages of curriculum and a Curriculum Toolbox were added to assist educators in meeting the needs of all students. The curriculum is aligned with current state academic standards or standards recommended by the American School Counseling Association.

### **Migratory Students**

Timely and proper identification of qualifying migratory students is the basis of the Title I, Part C program's support to ensuring the continuum of a student's Pre-K–12 education. The SCDE currently employs two full-time and one part-time regional recruiter, with one of them also working part-time as the state Identification and Recruitment (Id&R) Coordinator. The state level recruiters determine and establish eligibility for migratory students less than 22 years of age via a face-to-face interview with the student or the parent/guardian that usually occurs at the students' current residences. The recruiters follow up on the National Migratory Student Information Exchange (MSIX) database notifications and notifications from crew leaders, guardians, students, and school personnel. Eligibility is documented via an approved U.S. Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education (OME) Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which includes the minimum data elements (MDE). Due to the high mobility of migratory children/youth,

the COE can be used as proof of residence. Within one week of obtainment, COEs are sent to the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children Program (MEP) state data specialist who introduces the COE data elements into the state migratory student database (MIS2000) which uploads nightly to the national migrant student information exchange database. Other needs are identified during a face-to-face interview process by the recruiter with parents/guardians.

The Title I, Part C staff have actively provided PD, and will continue its commitment to do so as it is a way to support equitable access to a well-rounded education for migratory students. Title I, Part C PD includes explaining the program, advocating for migratory students, and explaining the “Seven Areas of Concern for Migratory Students” identified by the OME. Title I, Part C staff have presented at state and local events for the following programs: Title I, Part A; Title III/English Speakers of other Languages (ESOL); McKinney-Vento Homeless; Adult Education; Special Education; Summer Feeding Program; Migrant Health; Migrant Head Start; and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) local programs.

### **Supporting Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness**

The McKinney-Vento State Coordinator provides PD to LEA liaisons and other LEA personnel on homeless children and youth that focuses on building capacity to reduce the student achievement gap and enable all children and youth living in transition to meet the Profile as graduates prepared for success in college, careers, and citizenship. This PD includes the academic and non-academic needs of homeless children and youth.

McKinney-Vento Homeless Children and Youth in South Carolina score significantly less on statewide assessments compared to all students. Additionally, in 2014, a greater percentage of homeless youth (16 percent) dropped out of high school as compared to the overall population (2.6 percent). These and other academic and non-academic measures will continue to be monitored to understand the challenges and target technical assistance to support LEAs.

The needs of homeless students can be thought of in three ways. First are the *affective needs*. These needs include a sense of belonging, caring, and a supportive and nurturing atmosphere. With affective needs, educators, schools, and districts should help students develop a sense of belonging, intrinsic motivation, and attend to emotional needs.

The second need includes *academic needs*. Homeless students have academic needs that are sometimes overshadowed by other needs. With academic needs, educators, schools, and districts should focus on academic achievement and working towards academic progress.

*Technical needs* include those areas of assistance such as assistance with outside organizations, homeless shelters, housing, food, clothing, etc. With technical needs, educators, schools, and districts should focus on the outside needs of homeless students such as assistance with food, housing referrals to agencies, and consider relationship with parents in working with students.

For homeless and highly mobile (HHM) students, changing schools is accompanied by a variety of negative emotional, social, physical, psychological, and academic effects. Other teaching and classroom strategies to assist teachers of HHM students include:

- Realigning their own perceptions,

- Improving the classroom environment/culture,
- Improving the academic performance of HHM students,
- Improving the curriculum for HHM students,
- Increasing social engagement, and
- Working collaboratively and expanding on existing services for military-connected children that offer training for counselors and career specialists.

As a new strategy, the McKinney-Vento State Coordinator will begin providing PD to LEA liaisons and other LEA personnel on trauma-informed care. Recent research on the brain and trauma provides a new paradigm to schools and educators working with children and youth who are experiencing homelessness. Understanding how trauma impacts brain development puts harmful behaviors and destructive thinking patterns in context and gives helpers and educators a roadmap for building relationships, programs, and school environments that promote healing, growth, and educational excellence.

The McKinney-Vento State Coordinator will work with the career specialist services to increase awareness among school counselors of the need to assist homeless youths with receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework and to provide credit recovery. The State Coordinator will also provide school counselors with training on the need to help all homeless students prepare for college and careers. As a new strategy, a higher education network to support McKinney-Vento students applying and entering college will be developed.

The McKinney-Vento State Coordinator encourages LEAs to provide opportunities for homeless students to enroll in AP courses, International Baccalaureate programs, dual-enrollment programs, GT programs, and other academic programs. LEAs are encouraged to assist homeless students in participating in fine arts programs. LEAs are encouraged to reach out to the local community to provide items needed for participation in extra-curricular activities, including athletic gear, musical instruments, and other tools or equipment as necessary.

Identifying and meeting the academic and non-academic needs of children and youth living in transition is an on-going dynamic practice. McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

### **Collaborative Efforts Between McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part C Programs**

The SCDE's McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act program and the Title I, Part C program have collaborated to create an occupation survey to screen for homeless or migratory eligibility that can be used in school enrollment packets to identify students. In an effort to ensure proper identification of migratory students and their inclusion as automatically categorically eligible students, communication between schools and migratory families, school readiness, educational support for parents/guardians of migratory students, and prevent dropout of migratory students, South Carolina developed four main goals for migratory students in its comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) and State Service Delivery Plan (SDP). The next CNA/SDP is for school year 2017–18 and will be conducted under OME guidance. The current goals are as follows:

- Increase the percentage of migratory students passing the ELA state standardized test (i.e. strategies include small group and individualized instruction, staff development for teachers on meeting migratory students' ELA needs, in-service and technical

assistance to schools regarding identification of MEP students, proper procedure for documentation, and provision of needed resources);

- Increase in the percentage of migratory students passing the math state standardized test;
- Improve school readiness of migratory children (i.e. strategies include informing parents prior to leaving to bring records or educational information to document academic progress, establish relationships with the sending states to receive records prior to the school year ending, marry the state and national migrant student databases with East Coast (ChildPlus)/PowerSchool to assist with accurate assessment and grade level, collaborate with local agencies); and
- Increase the high school graduation rate and better prepare migratory students for success after graduation (i.e. strategies include outreach efforts to school principals, monitoring student graduation rates, reviewing courses and number of credits for students, contacting school counselors for a plan of action for credit accrual and graduation, monitoring high school students for progress every semester).

### **English Learners**

The SCDE requires each LEA to have EL Accommodation Plans in place for all qualifying EL students. These plans are student specific and are in place to ensure support for the student at each grade level K–12, until they meet “fully English proficient” status based on the state criteria. In addition, the SCDE requires that LEAs monitor exited students for a period of ~~two~~ **four** years to ensure support is maintained for those students who may still need assistance after exiting a formal EL program.

The SCDE also supports ELs by monitoring LEAs to ensure that federal Office of Civil Rights (OCR) obligations are met for all EL students, which includes no retentions of EL students based on language proficiency. All LEAs must have supporting evidence of EL retentions to show that language was not a deciding factor in retention. In addition, students must be allowed to complete coursework to earn a high school diploma until their 21st birthday.

The Office of Federal and State Accountability Special Populations, Title III is responsible for the oversight of the language instruction of limited-English proficient (LEP) and immigrant students. This program engages in the following strategies to ensure successful language instruction:

- Administers grant programs that help children develop proficiency in English and achieve high content standards;
- Recommends policies and promotes best practices for meeting the needs of EL;
- Strengthens collaboration and coordination among federal, state, and local programs serving EL; and
- Monitors funded programs and provides technical assistance that addresses outcomes and accountability.

The SCDE requires that all districts administer an HLS to parents/guardians of students in K–12 which asks, at a minimum, what the first language the child learned to speak was, what language is most often spoken in the home, which language the parent(s) would like to receive communication from the school in, and the birth country of the child. If the child’s first language is something other than English, the district must administer an initial language proficiency screening test within ten days.

1. The SCDE's strategy is to follow the Department's guidelines for student teacher ratio in classes with EL, the identification of EL, adequate service to ELs and PD for EL and regular classroom teachers working with ELs.
2. The SCDE's rationale is to develop ELP so students can meet the challenging academic standards of the state and earn a high school diploma.
3. The SCDE's is administering the EL program, including the new requirements from ESSA, throughout the 2017–18 school year.
4. The SCDE's funding is in place. Title III subgrant funds for all districts are in place. Funding is based on language proficiency levels and 135th day data.

### **Children with Disabilities**

The SCDE's Office of Special Education Services (OSES) is responsible for improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities in the state and for ensuring that LEAs and state operated programs (SOPs) meet program requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The OSES provides PD that focuses on building the capacity of LEAs and SOPs to reduce the achievement gap and enable all students with disabilities to graduate high school and be career ready. The SCDE is committed to ensuring that each student with a disability receives a free appropriate public education, achieves positive academic and social emotional outcomes, and gains world class skills, knowledge, and behaviors to continue their education, be competitively employed, and live independently after they leave school. In this mission, the OSES has a guided strategic plan that addresses four main goals:

1. Supporting state efforts to ensure that preschoolers with disabilities start school ready to learn;
2. Supporting state efforts to ensure that students with disabilities achieve at higher outcomes;
3. Ensuring that students with disabilities and their families receive positive supports, resources, and services; and
4. Ensuring that youth and young adults obtain meaningful post-secondary services for continued education, employment, and independent/community living.

Detailed information about the various activities that are carried out for students with disabilities are set forth in South Carolina's Annual Performance Report (APR) and the State Performance Plan (SPP) which is submitted annually to the Department's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Copies of the plans are available at <http://ed.sc.gov/districts-schools/special-education-services/fiscal-and-data-management-fdm/data-collection-and-reporting/state-performance-plan-and-state-determinations>.

### **Supporting At-Risk Students**

The SCDE helps LEAs support students who are identified at-risk of not meeting South Carolina academic standards through the response to intervention (RTI) multi-tiered systems of supports framework, which is a research- and evidence-based instructional model provided to all students in academic and behavior areas. RTI identifies students who are not meeting standards, plans and provides research and evidence-based interventions for those not achieving, closely monitors the progress of targeted students, and intervenes at a higher level if students do not progress toward age-appropriate levels.

Additionally, all LEAs in the state are required to offer a summer reading camp to all identified third grade students who are not reading proficiently on grade level. The SCDE provides technical assistance and training regarding best practices for implementing the

summer reading camp. Identified students have opportunities to receive small group and individual instruction by highly effective teachers who have experience in working with struggling readers to work on their reading, writing, listening, and researching skills.

### **Ensuring Educational Stability for Foster Care Students**

Children and youth in foster care are more likely than their peers who are not in foster care to experience adverse educational outcomes, including academic achievement in reading/language arts and math, grade retention, high school graduation, and post-secondary enrollment due to high mobility and lack of educational stability. The SCDE supports LEAs as they address these challenges and ensures educational stability for children and youth in foster care by engaging in the following strategies:

- Identifying a point of contact at the SCDE to ensure that districts are trained and kept up-to-date regarding federal legislation related to foster care children and youth;
- Building collaborative partnerships with the SCDSS to establish and distribute uniform, statewide policies regarding best interest determination and transportation dispute resolution processes;
- Fostering collaborative partnerships with existing programs that focus on behavioral, consumer, natural, physical, and social sciences. The OCTE's Family and Consumer Sciences courses emphasize relationship building, coping, problem-solving, decision-making skills, nutrition, chemical reactions, spatial planning, environmental issues, and the well-being of families, individuals, and communities.
- Working collaboratively with the SCDSS to develop resources for LEAs and local child welfare agencies such as the following: a checklist for decision making regarding best interest in school-of-origin decisions, Best Interest Determination for Foster Care School Placement forms, and Immediate Enrollment of Child in Foster Care forms;
- Identifying a point of contact at each LEA to collaborate with local child welfare services to ensure (1) that a child in foster care will enroll or remain in the child's school or origin unless a determination is made that it is not in the child's best interest to attend that school; (2) that if a determination is made that it is not in the child's best interest to remain in the school of origin, the child will be immediately enrolled in a new school, even if the child is unable to produce records normally required for enrollment, and (3) that a new (enrolling) school immediately contacts the school of origin to obtain relevant academic and other records;
- Maintaining a complete listing of each LEA foster care points of contact on the SCDE website;
- Providing training in partnership with the SCDSS for LEA foster care points of contact and local child welfare agency points of contact regarding uniform guidelines and the development of LEA written transportation procedures governing how transportation to maintain children in foster care in their school of origin when in their best interest will be provided, arranged, and funded for the duration of the time in foster care; and
- Using monitoring instruments to monitor LEAs to ensure compliance with best interest determinations of foster care students and to ensure adherence to requirements for the immediate enrollment of students moved because remaining in their schools was not in their best interest.

### **VirtualSC**

South Carolina's statewide virtual school program, VirtualSC, offers rigorous, standards-aligned online options to students in grades 7–12 to assist LEAs and schools in

supporting their students and support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out. Virtual SC also offers a keyboarding course that can be used at any grade level. VirtualSC courses are exempt from a seat time requirement and allow students to move through courses based on mastery of academic content. Students can supplement their coursework with courses at a variety of academic levels (AP, honors, college preparatory and credit recovery) to assist them with staying on schedule to graduate and prepare for post-secondary education or a career. All students in grades 7–12 have access to a complete course catalog that includes the following subject areas: CATE, social studies, English, fine arts, health/physical education, world languages, mathematics, and science. VirtualSC, which is funded through state funds allocated by the General Assembly, is providing an equitable option for all public, private, home school, and Adult Education students. VirtualSC also offers a variety of resources directly to schools to support appropriate promotion practices.

VirtualSC will continue to develop and offer a variety of online courses that impact student abilities to stay on track to graduate or take courses of interest toward their high school diploma. VirtualSC will increase student and school participation with a variety of resources to include the following: elementary keyboarding, test preparation resources, and EdReady, which is used to improve basic math and ELA skills. These resources and online courses are offered at no cost to all students in South Carolina.

### **Gifted and Talented**

GT students may be identified and served in grades one through twelve. Census screening by the SCDE is done in second grade and encouraged by LEAs annually. Students have access to GT classes in grades three through twelve, International Baccalaureate programs (limited schools), and AP courses in all high schools. Students in rural schools or schools with limited resources have access to AP classes through VirtualSC.

### **Supporting Students through Family and Community Engagement**

Research continually highlights the fact that families have major influences on their children's achievement in school and throughout life. Regardless of income or background, students whose families are involved are more likely to engage in the following:

- Earn high grades and test scores, and enroll in higher-level programs;
- Pass their classes, earn credits, and be promoted;
- Attend school regularly; and
- Graduate and go on to post-secondary education.

An LEA that receives a Title I, Part A allocation of greater than \$500,000 must reserve not less than one (1) percent of its Title I, Part A allocation to carry out the provisions of section 1116, including promoting family literacy and parenting skills. The SCDE's Office of Federal and State Accountability monitors Title I, Part A LEA and schoolwide plans yearly to ensure that parents, families, and communities play an integral part in this process. LEAs also receive onsite monitoring visits every three years to ensure compliance. In addition, the Office of State and Federal Accountability offers resources such as online family engagement toolkits, training opportunities at state and local conferences, program evaluation tools, and on-site assistance. The office is in the process of developing regional parent and family engagement sessions for educators and families to assist in their family and community engagement efforts.



Title I, Part A provides family and community engagement opportunities at every level of the program, including the development and implementation of the state, district, and schoolwide plans. LEAs that receive funds under Title I, Part A must plan and implement these programs, activities, and procedures with meaningful consultation with parents/guardians of children participating in Title I, Part A programs. LEAs must also develop a written parent and family engagement policy that establishes the LEAs expectations for family and community involvement that is developed jointly with, and agreed upon with, the parents/guardians of children participating in Title I, Part A programs.

In addition to the support offered by the Office of Federal and State Accountability, the Office of Family and Community Engagement seeks to identify strategies that are inclusive, encouraging, and effective in initiating and sustaining positive school-parent/guardian partnerships. By establishing partnerships with other state agencies, the School Improvement Councils, institutions of higher education, civic organizations, and churches throughout the state, the SCDE will increase its efforts in connecting community resources to support schools in engaging families. The Office of Family and Community Engagement will provide access to parent resources, links to PD seminars, and will continue to explore research on best practices to engage families in the academic achievement and success of their children.

The SCDE Office of Adult Education supports adult education programs in offering family literacy services. The purpose of comprehensive family literacy is to assist adults who are parents or family members in obtaining the education and skills that are necessary to becoming full partners in the educational development of their children. These skills lead to sustainable improvements in the economic opportunities for their family. Access to family literacy also assists adults in attaining a secondary school diploma and in the transition to postsecondary education and training, including through career pathways.

There are two universal barriers that hinder students from participating in adult education: child care and transportation. Adult education programs strive to address those barriers through family literacy and adult education services.

Adult Education Programs offer:

- Onsite child care;
- Child care vouchers in collaboration with the SC Department of Social Services for enrolled students;
- Parent Education classes which help parents increase their understanding of child development and the importance of language, literacy, social and emotional development;
- Interactive Literacy Activities (ILA), which are sessions that the child and parent engage in together to strengthen adult education, parenting skills, reinforce the child's early literacy, language and math skills, and demonstrate the critical role the parent plays in their children's educational and social emotional development; and
- In fulfillment of the WIOA which was enacted on July 22, 2014, the Office of Adult Education is working with a team of four adult education program directors to pilot career pathways through family literacy. Career pathways are a cross-system alignment of education and training that is focused on the needs of high-demand

industry sectors and occupations. Local Workforce Development Areas in South Carolina collaborated to focus on the skill needs of regional economies, and the establishment of career pathways systems. These systems make it easier for all South Carolinians to attain the skills and credentials needed for family-supporting jobs and careers. Through the benefits of family literacy and the parent education component, the team is developing career ladders and access to training programs and apprenticeships that offer a clear sequence, or pathway, of education coursework and/or training that will lead to credentials and/or post-secondary education. Potential Family literacy career pathways include: Instructional Assistant, Child Care Center Director and/or Owner, Child Care Employee, etc.

The Office of Early Learning and Literacy (OELL) supports family engagement and employs the following goals and strategies.

**Goal 1: Building collaboration with higher education research and training programs, faith-based, civic, and community organizations - including state and local agencies, to support South Carolina's family engagement and literacy efforts.**

State Strategies:

- Work collaboratively with all offices and agencies supporting family and community engagement priorities to align efforts.
- Develop an asset map of agencies and organizations that can help districts and schools with family engagement and literacy efforts.
- Develop and disseminate information about the family-centered learning opportunities, resources, and services offered by faith-based, nonprofit, medical and other organizations.
- Provide a clearinghouse of Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) research opportunities.

**Goal 2: Developing and disseminating information and resources to support ongoing learning opportunities for families that focus on advancing children's and students' literacy.**

State Strategies:

- Develop a webpage on the SCDE website featuring research and best practice resources in literacy and family-community engagement, and provide access to all stakeholders.
- Provide districts with a list of topics and professional learning resources to support ongoing learning opportunities for families.

**Goal 3: Developing systems that help families and schools support literacy at home.**

State Strategies:

- Develop a framework for family-community engagement.

**Goal 4: Developing a public information campaign about the importance of family and community engagement for supporting children's and students' literacy.**

State Strategies:

- Develop a clear message regarding the importance of family and community engagement in students' literacy.
- Develop a communications toolkit and conduct a statewide messaging campaign about the importance of family and community engagement for literacy.
- Develop a marketing plan to bring attention to the importance of literacy.

#### **Additional Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Strategies**

- Funding to support CCLC;
- SCDE PD on Readiness Assessments, which includes family engagement strategies for early childhood educators on early language and literacy tips for families and for sharing assessment data; and
- The SCDE's Office of State and Federal Accountability resources, such as an online family engagement toolkit, training opportunities at state and local conferences, program evaluation tools for family and community engagement programs, and on-site assistance to schools and districts wishing to improve family and community engagement efforts.
- EEDA requires that parents/guardians be invited to participate in the annual IGP conferences with their children. The goal is to ensure that parents/guardians are aware of the connection between their children's academic progress and career aspirations.

## **B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children**

1. Supporting Needs of Migratory Children (*ESEA section 1304(b)(1)*): Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:
  - i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;
  - ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;
  - iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and
  - iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

The following addresses how out-of-school youth (OSY), migratory children who have dropped out of school, migratory students attending K–12 schooling, and preschool migratory children have their unique needs identified and addressed described in each subsection.

- i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children, including preschool, OSY, and K–12 students from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs, starts with identification of students and their needs. The needs for OSY, including recent OSY dropouts, preschool, and K–12 migratory students are met via Title I, Part C funded programs and collaboration and referral to the following: East Coast Migrant and Head Start Program (ECMHSP), Migratory Health Services, local WIOA funded programs, Telamon, other federal supplementary educational programs, and other programs such as Title I, Part A, McKinney-Vento Homeless, Special Education, Adult Education, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Summer Feeding Programs, and collaboration with local and state non-profit and private entities.

To identify the OSY, preschool, and K–12 migratory students and to address their unique educational needs the Title I, Part C Program implements a statewide system of Identification and Recruitment (Id&R) of eligible migratory children and youth using state-level regional recruiters who oversee the training of recruiters for local operating agencies (LOAs). The SCDE currently employs two full-time and one part-time state level regional recruiter, with one of them also working part-time as the state Id&R Coordinator. The state level recruiters determine and establish eligibility for migratory students younger than 22 years of age via a face-to-face interview with the student or the parent/guardian that usually occurs at the students' current residences. This process includes preschool, OSY, K–12 students, and migratory students who have dropped out of school. Eligibility is documented via an approved USED Office of Migrant Education (OME) COE that includes the minimum data elements (MDE). Due to the high mobility of migratory children/youth, the COE can be used as proof of residence. COEs are sent within one week of their obtainment to the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children Program (MEP) state data specialist who introduces the COE data elements into the MIS2000, which uploads nightly to MSIX database.

To bolster the statewide system of Id&R, the state's Education for Homeless Children and Youth (a.k.a. McKinney-Vento) Program and the Title I, Part C program have collaborated to create an occupational survey to screen students for homeless and/or migratory eligibility. This tool can be used in school enrollment packets to identify students. The state level regional recruiters follow up on possible migratory students to verify their eligibility. The recruiter identifies other needs during a face-to-face interview with the parents/guardians or emancipated youth.

The Title I, Part C Program implements several quality control measures for ensuring proper identification for migratory children and youth. Recruiters and LOA staff receive annual training which includes cultural competency components based on the cultural and linguistic data collected from the field, and training on how to obtain the MDEs required for eligibility determinations. State level regional recruiters are assessed annually via a formal infield observation evaluation with an evaluation tool based on recruiter responsibilities signed at the beginning of the year. LOAs' quality compliance is verified via by the Title I, Part C State Coordinator on-site monitoring using a monitoring instrument based upon OME's instrument for SEAs, which includes quality control components as legally required and includes formal processes for resolving eligibility questions. The state level Title I, Part C staff complete annual re-interviews of student COEs for quality control and conduct independent re-interviews triennially; details are in the SC MEP 2014 Id&R Manual which is currently being updated.

Annual verification and documentation of migratory children and youth are conducted via face-to-face interviews by the recruiter, and the SC MEP state data specialist verifies the COE data element, "Qualifying Moves Previous 12 Months," with the state's migratory database, MIS2000, and MSIX data to certify student moves during the regular school year. Using MIS2000 as the state migratory student database allows the SCMEP state data specialist to run reports on residence dates, withdrawal dates, enrollment dates, and residency verification dates that can be crossed checked with the MSIX database and the state's student database, PowerSchool, to ensure an accurate annual count of eligible migratory students. Subgrant recipient pretests, school standardized testing data from PowerSchool, and/or MSIX are used to determine students at risk of failing and those failing state standardized tests; these students are to have priority for services (PFS).

The unique educational and other needs of migratory youth who have dropped out of school are assessed by the state Title I, Part C Program staff and subgrantees immediately after an out-of- school youth (OSY) is qualified for MEP services by a trained recruiter using an OSY student profile that was developed through participation in an intra-state consortium for OSY. State level regional recruiters and subgrant recipients use this information to determine and provide appropriate educational services to the OSY. MEP subrecipients (LOAs) assess the unique educational needs of preschool and K-12 children via a pretest assessment to determine the educational services to be provided. To determine the needs of students in non-project areas, the Title I, Part C state office SC MEP uses the MSIX database and relays the needs to the applicable school district if the students are present during the regular school year. Other needs are identified by the recruiter during the face-to-face interview with the parents/guardian or the youth.

The current Title I, C measurable program objectives and outcomes (MPOs) and strategies are created based upon the identification of the unique needs of migratory students in the state and are implemented on a statewide basis for the Title I, C program and its subgrantees. Subgrant applications are based on MPOs from the CNA and State Service Delivery Plan (SDP).

Subgrantees' annual program evaluations are based on the assessment of implementation of MPOs and strategies. The current SC MEP CNA is based upon identification of the state's migratory students, including OSY/drop outs, K-12, and preschool students, and their needs. A new CNA/SDP process will be undertaken for SY2017-18.

Since virtually all recruitment is done where the student resides, recruiters are instrumental in building rapport with families, which allows for trust to build. Eventually, students and families feel comfortable to share with recruiters other non-academic needs they may have. Both instructional and support services provided at the state and LOA level are documented via a tracking form divided by pre-K, K-12, and OSY that is based on the OSY consortium-created tracking form. The LOAs sign assurances via their Grant Award Notification (GAN) to submit the tracking forms bi-weekly to the state data specialist who enters the information into MIS2000. Unique instructional services provided and tracked include reading, math, General Education Development (GED) prep, social studies, science, ESOL, preschool. Unique support services provided and tracked include referred services, nutritional, health, translation/interpreting, transportation, and other services requiring description. As Title I, Part C state staff and subgrantees (LOAs) conduct Id&R and provide services at students' residences; they are intimate with the unique needs of migratory children and youth and are keenly aware that migratory students cannot be academically successful if other unique needs, mostly falling under OME's seven areas of concern, are not addressed.

The state recruiters and subgrantees (LOAs) use the OSY student profile and assessment information as the basis for providing or referring appropriate educational services to the OSY and recent dropouts. The unique educational needs of preschool and K-12 children are assessed by MEP subrecipients via a pretest assessment which determines the educational services to be provided. For students in non-project areas, the MSIX database is used to determine the needs of the students, which are then relayed to the school district if the students are present during the regular school year, and recruiters refer the students to community agencies and other federal and state educational programs.

To minimize time between needs assessment and provision of services, LOAs are required by signed assurances in their GAN to turn in COEs to the data specialist within one week, and to turn in tracking forms, profiles, and as other data within two weeks. State level regional recruiters are required to hand in COEs within one week and tracking forms within two weeks to the state data specialist as they agree via signature on their annual recruiter responsibilities agreement and assessed via their annual review. Other needs are identified during the face-to-face interview process by the recruiter with the parents/guardian/youth.

For successful funding, LOAs are required to describe in Component 5 of the application how they will meet the unique needs of migratory children and youth

(OSY/dropouts/pre-K/K–12) via ensuring collaboration with other federal and non-federal education programs. Specifically, they must describe how program resources will be used to locate, identify, and enroll eligible migratory children and youth and how resources will be used to provide support services that may address special needs such as health service(s), guidance, home-school contact, food service, transportation, facility maintenance, or other support services. The LOAs must also describe plans for coordinating services and activities with other federal, state, and local programs to ensure access to these resources for migratory students and how they will coordinate with intrastate and interstate agencies to ensure the timely transfer of student records. An annual evaluation report and section B2a Coordination of Services of the monitoring instrument is used to assess an LOA's success in implementing this component.

- ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving PK, K–12, and OSY migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A is guided by the CNA/SDP. The CNA/SDP creates the MPOs and best practices that drive the state application for subgrantees and the program evaluation. The unique needs identified in the CNA/SDP and the MPOs and strategies developed to address them were created by the MEP practitioners, other practitioners, and administrators from the McKinney-Vento Homeless program, the Neglected and Delinquent program, the Title III program, the Title I, Part A program, the Adult Education program, and the Migratory Head Start program. The identified needs, the MPOs, and the strategies were created in categories addressing OSY, dropout, preschool, and K–12 migratory students. The CNA/SDP forms the application and evaluation for the Title I, Part C program in South Carolina. Federal and state education and service providers will also be included in the upcoming CNA/SDP for the state's Title I, Part C process.
- iii. The integration of services available under Title I, part C with services provided by other local, state, and federal programs for OSY, K–12, and preschool migratory children considering their unique needs for academic success are ensured by the following:

Title I, Part C subgrantees are required to consult with parents of migratory children via a parent advisory council (PAC) for regular school year programs and to demonstrate evidence of parent consultation for summer programs. Subrecipients sign the assurances and conditions of the GAN to ensure their compliance with the requirements for parent consultation. The SCDE's Title I, Part C program conducts a PAC at the state level during its annual MEP training.

South Carolina MEP uses MIS2000, which uploads nightly to the federal MSIX database, which allows for the timely transfer of pertinent student records (including information on health if included), and also allows for informing other states of arriving or departing students, both during the regular school year and beyond it. If they know where students are heading, the state Title I, Part C staff also send MSIX notifications, and the staff follow up on MSIX notifications from other states. The MIS2000 complies with the new federal regulations for MDE requirements for MSIX. SC MEP staff has collaborated with staff from the SCDE's Office of Research and Data Analysis and the MIS2000 to insure valid and reliable student data to comply with time requirements for the MSIX database MDEs. South Carolina is using MSIX State Data Quality grant funds for implementing the MSIX MDEs.

MSIX has been presented at statewide Title I, Part A, Title III/ESOL, and McKinney Vento Homeless trainings to make non-project districts aware of the resource.

South Carolina's MEP also participates in two OME Consortium Incentive Grants (CIGs) to ensure interstate coordination of quality services for migratory children and youth. The SC MEP recruiters know and communicate personally with recruiters in other states regarding student moves and needs. SC MEP has an extensive intrastate communication network that facilitates the timely transfer of records and the provision of academic and support services to students, especially those who move during the regular school year and have a priority for service.

The following example illustrates this coordination: South Carolina is a receiving state with the majority of students present for between two and four weeks in the summer. This past summer, an OSY dropout parent was identified and qualified by a state recruiter in the Upstate region. The OSY needs assessment profile is on the COE. After the recruiter gained trust with the student, the recruiter found that the student had an intense desire to complete her GED. The recruiter informed the LOA immediately, and between the LOA and the recruiter, they provided the student with academic support and assistance for the weeks she was in the area. She then migrated to the low country to a non-project area. The recruiter for that area obtained a new COE and immediately commenced providing academic support by bringing library books on GED prep to the student and providing support services to her and her children. After a few weeks, the student moved to Florida and the state director sent an MSIX notification and spoke directly with the local MEP. The state director and the local MEP were then able to get the student enrolled into Adult Education classes and also ensured services for her and her children.

The current Title I, Part C MPOs and strategies are implemented on a statewide basis for the Title I, Part C program and its subgrantees, and include strategies to ensure inter-state and intra-state coordination. For successful funding, LOAs are required to describe in Component 5 of the application how they will meet the unique needs of migratory children and youth (OSY/dropouts/pre-K/K-12) via ensuring collaboration with other federal and non-federal education and other programs. Specifically, they must describe plans for coordinating services and activities with other federal, state, and local programs to ensure access to these resources for migratory students. The LOAs must state how they will coordinate with intrastate and interstate agencies to ensure the timely transfer of student records. LOA success in implementation of this component is assessed via an annual evaluation report and section B2a Coordination of Services of the monitoring instrument.

Via signature on their Title I, Part C subaward, subgrantees certify their understanding of and intention to comply with the terms and conditions of the subaward, which includes giving priority to migratory students that meet the statutory definition of PFS and the use of strategies for completing the MPOs as created by the CNA/SDP process. Requirements include at least bi-weekly submissions of student service tracking forms for OSY, K-12, and preschool students and weekly submissions of COEs. The subgrantee monitoring tool includes verification of PFS students served on a priority basis. Regional recruiters also sign an annual agreement to document and submit, at a minimum, bi-weekly student service tracking forms and weekly COEs. Final evaluation reports are required by the subgrantees that measure



the implementation and success of the programmatic components including services to PFS students

The state's MEP cross verifies the COE data element "Qualifying Moves Previous 12 Months," with MIS2000 and the MSIX data to certify moves during the regular school year. Subgrantee pretests, school standardized testing data from the state student database, and the MSIX database are used to determine students as being at risk of failing or failing state standardized tests. The state MEP's responsibility is to evaluate the implementation and results of the program especially for PFS students. An implementation evaluation serves to determine the extent to which the program meets the needs of migratory students, with a focus on PFS students. Indicators examined in the evaluation include comparing documented participation and performance of migratory students against the created MPOs.

The SC MEP's criteria and prioritization of services for PFS students is described in the following extract from the subgrant application instructions:

Priority For Services (Section 1304 (d)) Subgrantees are required to offer and document how funds/services were first offered to migrant students who "are failing, or at most risk of failing, to meet the State's challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

LOAs and regional recruiters have access to the MSIX database and, after obtaining a COE, can determine whether the student qualifies as PFS by the moves documented on the COE and by cross referencing the data with MSIX information on moves and state standardized test scores. However, if the information is not complete in the MSIX database, moves are documented by the parent, guardian, or youth affidavit on the COE, and assessments are done by the subgrantee to gauge the student's academic level to determine if they are failing or at risk of failing state standardized tests. COEs must be submitted to the state data specialist within one week of their obtainment. The state data specialist also cross verifies the MSIX student information to verify PFS status.

- iv. The following goals represent the unique education needs of OSY, K-12, and preschool migratory children that were identified in the CNA process by practitioners that were enumerated in the SDP. Goal, and Component 1 and 2 detail the unique needs and concerns regarding K-12 students and strategies for each MPO. Goal and Component 3 address the unique needs and concerns regarding preschool migratory children and strategies for each MPO; and Goal and Component 4 address the unique needs and concerns regarding OSY and strategies for each MPO. A new CNA/SDP process will be undertaken for 2017-18 with guidance from OME. The 2017-18 process will also include joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children and youth, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A and will address integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and ensure for the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal educational programs while considering their unique educational needs for academic success.

**The following is taken from the SC MEP 2014–16 CNA and SDP.**

**Goal 1: Proficiency in ELA**

**Concern Statement:** The CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that migrant students are not properly identified during the school year, inadequate communication exists between schools and migratory families, and that migratory students have a lower passing percentage rate on state standardized achievement tests than non-migratory students.

**Need Indicator:** Interrupted education, sporadic attendance, lack of supplemental educational services, improper identification, and lack of parental involvement

**Data Source:** PowerSchool; state report card; migratory student scores on state standardized tests compared with all students; ELP; migratory school enrollment and attendance; economic disadvantage status; PFS student characteristics; and participation rates in other programs such as AP, GT programs, special education, Title III, McKinney Vento Homeless education, child nutrition, early childhood programs, summer school, and regular school programs.

**Comparison Group:** Non-migratory students enrolled for the full school year.

**Need Statement:** Increase in scores on standardized tests.

**Goal 2: Mathematics**

**Concern Statement:** CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that migratory students are not properly identified during the school year, that inadequate communication exists between schools and migratory families; and that migratory students have a lower passing percentage rate on state standardized achievement tests than do non-migratory students.

**Need Indicator:** Interrupted education, sporadic attendance, lack of supplemental educational services, improper identification, and lack of parental involvement.

**Data Source:** PowerSchool; state report card; migratory student scores on state standardized tests compared with all students; ELP; migratory school enrollment and attendance; economic disadvantage status; PFS student characteristics; and participation rates in other programs such as AP, GT programs, special education, Title III, McKinney Vento Homeless education, child nutrition, early childhood programs, summer school, and regular school programs.

**Comparison Group:** Non-migratory students enrolled for the full school year.

**Need Statement:** Increase in scores on standardized tests.

**Goal 3: School Readiness**

**First Concern Statement:** (Educational Continuity) CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that there is a lack of efficiency in receiving school records (intra/interstate), which makes it challenging to develop an individualized plan for study for each child.

**Need Indicator:** Lack of complete data found in the MSIX database, MIS 2000, and COEs, ChildPlus from ECMHSP.

**Data Source:** MSIX database, MIS 2000, COEs, ChildPlus, ECMHSP

**Comparison Group:** Children enrolled for the full school year, children enrolled in regional Head Start.

**Need Statement:** Efficient and accurate data entry in the MSIX database, MIS 2000, on COEs, and in ChildPlus. Enhance data sharing between ECMHSP and SC MEP.

**Second Concern Statement:** (Educational Support in the Home) CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that parents lack strategies and access to resources in the community to provide additional educational support.

**Need Indicator:** Community Assessment data (community resources available), Family Literacy Surveys (Beaufort/Charleston), Parent Pre/Post Survey (ECMHSP).

**Data Source:** Demographics Data- language, literacy, education levels (ECMHSP), COEs, Family Literacy Survey (Beaufort/Charleston), Parent Pre/Post Survey (ECMHSP), Community Assessment (ECMHSP), Community Resource Directory.

**Comparison Group:** Regional Head Start, children enrolled year round in public school, children enrolled in private child care.

**Need Statement:** Increase parent education training on school readiness and the importance of parent engagement. Enhance community partnerships to increase awareness of the unique needs of migratory workers and their families and how our partners can better serve this population.

**Goal 4: Graduation From High School, Credit Accrual, Dropout Prevention, And Services To Out-Of-School Youth (OSY) Services**

**Concern Statement:** CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that mobility and short exposure to instruction often cause OSY to lose what they are taught and that the three hour service requirement is a challenge during the summer program due to several factors, and that there are unrealistic expectations for gains for OSY students.

**Need Indicator:** OSY usually have no parents with them to advocate for them, and Adult Education programs hesitate to provide classes if they are penalized for not getting 60 hours.

**Data Source:** Percentage of OSY students making gains on pre/posttests; Adult Education performance and attendance data.

**Comparison Group:** Non-migratory Adult Education students.

**Need Statement:** Gains of OSY students of pre/post tests will increase positively in correlation with number of hours of instruction received and length of stay in South Carolina.

**High School Graduation/Credit Accrual Concern Statement:** The CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned that most high school migratory students do not reside in the state for the entire school year. Schools are concerned about their graduation rates and are reluctant to enroll high school migratory students, sometimes denying enrollment. There seems to be a lack of awareness of available programs for high school migratory students and transportation. Older immigrant OSY (16–17 years of age) are denied enrollment due to LEP.

**Need Indicator:** Percentage of students meeting graduation requirements.

**Data Source:** High school graduation rates in South Carolina from report card grades and lack of data on migratory graduates.

**Comparison Group:** Non- migratory high school students.

**Need Statement:** Increase Id&R of migratory students enrolled in high school. When none are present, document the effort. When identified, increase efforts, [especially for students who may have an] IEP, and work with schools to ensure these students are a priority. All students identified and enrolled in high school will show an increase in credits toward graduation.

**Dropout Prevention Concern Statement:** The CNA/SDP practitioners are concerned with the lack of data for migratory dropouts.

**Need Indicator:** Migratory parents are usually LEP, have limited time available, and may be intimidated.

**Data Source:** Lack of data from the SCDE.

**Comparison Group:** non-migratory high school and middle school students.

**Need Statement:** Increase awareness and effort to retain students. Document efforts, percentage of students aware of programs available, percentage/increased. Increase Id&R of these students (high school and dropouts).

Enumerated below are the key strategies developed by the practitioners for the implementation of the MPOs. Included are the data elements to be used in evaluation and the method for collecting and reporting data. A new CNA/SDP process will be undertaken for 2017–18 with guidance from the OME.

The goals and MPOs form components of the Title I, Part C subrecipient application. Successful LOA applicants describe how they will implement strategies to obtain MPOs. For funding, LOAs sign assurances and conditions as part of their GAN to ensure they will abide by the procedures delineated in their application. If the LOAs were funded previously, the evaluation includes results from the previous years. This critical analysis allows for a continual improvement process in strategy implementation to ensure appropriate academic and support services to migratory children and youth.

**Component 1, Goal 1: Proficiency in ELA**

Students in South Carolina will be proficient in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language to ensure that all students are college- and career-ready in ELA no later than the end of high school.

**Required MPOs:** By the end of the 2013–14 academic year, and each year thereafter, the percentage of migratory students passing state standardized tests measuring ELA will increase by one percent.

**Key Strategies:**

- Provide small group and individualized instruction as supplemental educational services.
- Provide staff development to staff on meeting the migratory students' ELA needs.
- Provide in-services and technical assistance to schools on the identification of MEP students, proper procedure for documentation, and provision of needed resources.
- Coordinate services for MEP students and families with other school offices such as ESOL, Adult Education, teachers, parent advocates, and agencies to promote educational and social services to MEP students and families.

**MPO Data Element Method used for collecting/reporting data:**

Aggregate student scores on state standardized test, state level aggregate data, individualized student progress on test components, and individual pre/post assessment scores.

**Component 2, Goal 2: Mathematics.**

Students in South Carolina will be proficient in comprehension of mathematical concepts, operations, and relations, procedural fluency, and productive disposition to ensure that all students are college- and career-ready in mathematics no later than the end of high school.

**Required MPOs:** By the end of the 2013–14 academic year, and each year thereafter, the percentage of migratory students passing state standardized tests measuring mathematics will increase by one percent.

**Key Strategies:**

- Provide small group and individualized instruction as supplemental educational services.
- Provide staff development to staff on meeting the migratory students' math needs.
- Provide in-services and technical assistance to schools regarding identification of MEP students, proper procedure for documentation, and provision of needed resources.
- Coordinate services for MEP students and families with other school offices such as ESOL, Adult Education, teachers, parent advocates, and agencies to promote educational and social services to MEP students and families.

**MPO Data Element Method used for collecting/reporting data:** Aggregate student scores on state standardized tests, state level aggregate data, individualized student progress on test components, and individual pre/post assessment scores.

**Component 3, Goal 3: School Readiness.**

Children in South Carolina will engage in play to develop individual approaches to learning; show curiosity, eagerness, and satisfaction as a learner; demonstrate initiative, engagement, and persistence in learning; demonstrate an ability to envision a goal and to accomplish it; and extend their learning through the use of memory, reasoning, and problem-solving skills.

**Required MPOs:**

3a. By the end of the 2014–15 school year and each year after, there will be an improvement of data sharing between state agencies and data accuracy by 5 percent.

3b. By the end of the 2014–15 school year and each year after, the percentage of parents' participation will increase by at least 5 percent.

3c. After participating in at least two weeks of instruction, 50 percent of 3–4 year old migratory children and youth will demonstrate proficiency on assessments, checklists, or portfolios measuring developmental skills in language/literacy and math.

**Key Strategies: 3a.**

- Inform parents prior to leaving to bring records or educational information to document academic progress (Continuity Packet) through the district.
- Establish relationships with the sending states to receive records prior to the school year ending.
- Marry our MIS2000/MSIX and East Coast (ChildPlus)/ PowerSchool to assist with accurate assessment and grade level.

**Key Strategies: 3b.**

- Collaborate with local agencies use of community directories/memorandum of understanding.
- Provide referrals to agencies that provide service especially to those counties that do not have a MEP, family literacy, or education program.

**Key Strategy: 3c.**

Provide home-based and school-based school readiness instruction that reflects developmentally appropriate strategies ensuring that curriculum and instructional materials are in place.

**MPO Data Element Method used for collecting/reporting data:**

3a: instances of shared data MSIX, MIS 2000, COEs, ChildPlus (ECMHSP), and contact logs.

3b: documented participation of parents, Demographics Data- language, literacy, education levels (ECMHSP), COEs, Family Literacy Survey (Beaufort/Charleston), and Community Resource Directory.

3c: Parent Pre/Post Survey (ECMHSP), and Community Assessment (ECMHSP).

**Component 4, Goal 4: Graduation From High School, Credit Accrual, Drop Out Prevention, And Services To OSY**

The state's goal is to increase the high school graduation rate through efforts to better prepare students for success after graduation, whether their preference is to immediately enter the workforce or to continue their education. The state has set the goal that each high school in South Carolina reach a high school graduation rate of at least 90 percent.

**MPOs:**

4a. By the end of school year 2014 and thereafter, there will be a one percent increase of services to migratory students enrolled in high school.

4b. Migratory students identified and enrolled in high school will show a five percent increase in credit accrual towards graduation.

4c. By the end of school year 2014, there will be an increase of awareness of support programs to potential migratory students dropouts and families to decrease the migratory drop-out rate by two percent.

4d. By the end of school year 2014 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will receive individualized or small group instruction in life skills.

4e. By the end of school year 2014 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will receive individualized or small group instruction in ELA.

4f. By the end of school year 2014 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will receive individualized or small group instruction in math.

**Key Strategies: 4a**

- Increase Id&R efforts for migratory students in high school.
- Provide adoption/inclusion of migratory parent survey in school registration packets.
- Provide outreach efforts to school principals and attend principal meetings at least once a year.
- Provide in-services and technical assistance to schools regarding Id&R of MEP students and proper procedures for documentation and provision of needed resources.

**Key Strategies: 4b**

- Monitor student progress through the MSIX database; note designated graduation school.
- Review the student's courses and number of credits.
- Contact guidance counselor and discuss a plan of action for credit accrual and graduation.
- Monitor high school students for progress every semester.

**Key Strategies: 4c**

- Establish the number of dropouts in each district by the

- end of 2014 [taken from SC MEP 2014-16 CNA and SDP; a new CAN/SDP process will be undertaken in 2017–18].
- Increase outreach efforts to principals, guidance counselors, and migratory families.
- Provide in-services and technical assistance to schools regarding potential dropouts of MEP students and proper procedure for documentation and provision of needed resources.

**Key Strategies: 4d**

- Id&R as soon as possible upon arrival date to ensure early enrollment and delivery of services.
- Consult Department of Labor temporary H2a work visa website and crew leaders to determine proposed arrival date.
- Use OSY consortium Strategies, Opportunities, and Services for Out of School Youth (SOSOSY) life skills lessons.
- Provide instruction in life skills by SC MEP personnel including state level regional recruiters and LEA personnel.

**Key Strategies: 4e**

- Id&R as soon as possible upon arrival date to ensure early enrollment and delivery of services.
- Consult H2a website and crew leaders to determine proposed arrival date.
- Use SOSOSY ACRES lessons for Pre GED.
- Provide instruction in ELA by SC MEP personnel including LEA teachers and contracted service providers.
- Contract with Adult Education to provide ESL/ELA.

**Key Strategies: 4f**

- ID&R as soon as possible upon arrival date to ensure early enrollment and delivery of services.
- Consult H2a website and crew leaders to determine proposed arrival date.
- Use SOSOSY math lessons.
- SC MEP personnel including LEA teachers and contracted service providers will provide instruction in math.

**MPO Data Element Method used for collecting/reporting data**

4a: number of high school migratory students, number of services to high school migratory students, MIS2000, PowerSchool, and service logs.

4b: number of high school migratory students, amount of credits accrued towards graduation, MIS2000, PowerSchool, logs of recruiter/service provider and guidance counselor meetings and plans, and number of hours MEP provided assistance to high school migratory students.

4c: number of high school and middle school migratory students, number of high school and middle school migratory students at risk of failing or failing; number of contact hours with failing or at-risk-of-failing students and their families; MIS2000; PowerSchool; logs of recruiter/service provider and guidance counselor meetings and plans; and number of hours MEP provided assistance to high school and middle school migratory students and their families.



4d: number of OSY, number of life skills lessons, MIS2000, COEs, OSY tracking forms, and pre/post-tests.

4e: number of OSY, number of ELA lessons, MIS2000, COEs, OSY tracking forms, and pre/post-tests.

4f: number of OSY, number of math lessons, MIS2000, COEs, OSY tracking forms, and pre/posttests.

## **MPOs**

### **Goal 1: Proficiency in ELA**

MPO: By the end of the 2014–15 academic year and each year thereafter, the percentage of migratory students passing state standardized tests measuring ELA will increase by one percent.

### **Goal 2: Mathematics**

Required MPO: By the end of the 2014–15 academic year, and each year thereafter, the percentage of migratory students passing state standardized tests measuring mathematics will increase by one (1) percent.

### **Goal 3: School Readiness**

#### MPO:

3a. By the end of the 2014–15 school year and each year after, there will be an improvement of data sharing between state agencies and data accuracy by five percent.

3b. By the end of the 2014–15 school year and each year after, the percentage of parents' participation in the children's' academic development will increase by at least five percent.

3c. After participating in at least 2 weeks of instruction, 50 percent of 3–4 year old migratory children and youth will demonstrate proficiency on assessments, checklists, or portfolios measuring developmental skills in language/literacy and math.

### **Goal 4: Graduation From High School, Credit Accrual, Dropout Prevention, And Services To OSY.**

#### Required MPO:

4a. By the end of school year 2015 and thereafter, there will be a one percent increase of services to migratory students enrolled in high school.

4b. By the end of school year 2015, migratory students identified and enrolled in high school will show a five percent increase in credit accrual towards graduation.

4c. By the end of school year 2015, there will be an increased awareness of support programs for potential migratory students, dropouts, and families to decrease the migratory dropout rate by two percent.

4d. By the end of school year 2015 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will have received individualized or small group instruction in life skills.

4e. By the end of school year 2015 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will have received individualized or small group instruction in ELA.

4f. By the end of school year 2015 and thereafter, 25 percent of identified OSY will have received individualized or small group instruction in math.

2. Promote Coordination of Services (*ESEA section 1304(b)(3)*): Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

South Carolina Title I, Part C (MEP) uses MIS2000 which uploads nightly to the federal migratory student database, MSIX. This allows for the timely transfer of pertinent student records including information on health if included, and also allows for informing other states of arriving or departing students, whether it is during the regular school year or not. State Title I, Part C staff also sends MSIX notifications if they know where students are heading, and the staff follows up on MSIX notifications from other states. MIS2000 complies with the new federal regulations for Minimum Data Elements (MDE) requirements for MSIX. State SC Title I, Part C staff has been collaborating with staff from the SCDE Office of Research and Data Analysis and MIS2000 to insure valid and reliable student data to comply with time requirements for MSIX MDEs. SC MEP is using OME funds provided in a special GAN for implementation of MSIX MDEs. MSIX has been presented at statewide Title I, Part A, Title III/ESOL, McKinney Vento Homeless, and attendance clerks/Guidance Counselors/PowerSchool district staff trainings to make non-project districts aware of the resource to ensure the coordination of services with other federal and state program staff.

SC MEP also participates in two OME CIGs for interstate coordination with OME GAN funds to ensure interstate coordination of quality services for migratory children and youth. The SC MEP recruiters know and communicate personally with recruiters in other states regarding student moves and needs. SC MEP has an extensive intrastate communication network within the program and across other programs and agencies named in the response above which facilitates the timely transfer of records and the provision of academic and support services to students, especially those that move during the regular school year and have a priority for service.

This example will illustrate coordination: SC is a receiving state with the majority of students present for between two and four weeks in the summer. This past summer, an OSY dropout parent was identified and qualified by a state recruiter in the Upstate. The OSY needs assessment profile is on the COE. After the recruiter gained trust with the student, the recruiter found that she had an intense desire to complete her GED. The recruiter informed the LOA immediately, and between the LOA and the recruiter, they provided her with academic and support assistance for the weeks she was there. She then migrated to the low country to a non-project area. The recruiter for that area obtained a new COE and immediately commenced providing academic support by bringing library books on GED prep to the student and by providing support services to her and her children. After a few weeks, she moved to Florida, and the state director sent an MSIX notification and spoke directly with the local MEP. The state director and the local MEP

were then able to get her enrolled into Adult Education classes and also ensured services for her and her children.

The current Title I, Part C MPOs and strategies are implemented on a statewide basis for the Title I, Part C program and its subgrant recipients, and include strategies to ensure inter-state and intra-state coordination. For successful funding, LOAs are required to describe in Component 5 of the application how they will meet the unique needs of migratory children and youth (OSY/dropouts/pre-K/K–12) via ensuring collaboration with other federal and non-federal education and other programs. Specifically, they must describe plans for coordinating services and activities with other federal, state, and local programs to ensure access to these resources for migratory students. The LOAs must state how they will coordinate with intrastate and interstate agencies to ensure the timely transfer of student records. LOA success in implementation of this component is assessed via an annual evaluation report and section B2a Coordination of Services of the monitoring instrument.

3. Use of Funds (*ESEA section 1304(b)(4)*): Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.

Via signature on their Title I, Part C subaward, subgrant recipients certify their understanding of and intention to comply with the terms and conditions of the subaward, which includes giving priority to migratory students that meet the statutory definition of PFS and the use of strategies for completing the MPOs as created by the CNA/SDP process. Requirements for subgrant recipients include a minimum of bi-weekly submissions of student service tracking forms for OSY, K–12, and preschool students and weekly submissions of COEs. The subrecipient monitoring tool includes verification of PFS students served on a priority basis. State recruiters also sign an annual agreement to document and submit, at a minimum, bi-weekly student service tracking forms and weekly COEs. Final evaluation reports are required by the subgrantees that measure the implementation and success of the programmatic components including services to PFS students

The SC MEP uses the information from the COE data element 'Qualifying Moves Previous 12 Months' cross verified with MIS2000 and MSIX data to certify moves during the regular school year. Subrecipient pretests, school standardized testing data from the state student data base, and MSIX are utilized to determine students as being at risk of failing or failing state standardized tests. The state MEP's responsibility is to evaluate the implementation and results of the program especially for PFS students. Evaluation is accomplished with an implementation evaluation which serves to determine the extent to which the program meets the needs of migratory students, with a focus on PFS students. Indicators examined in the evaluation comprise of comparing documented participation and performance of migratory students against the created MPOs.

The SC MEP's criteria and prioritization of services for PFS students is described in the following extract from the subgrant application instructions:

Priority For Services (Section 1304 (d)) Subgrantees are required to offer and document how funds/services were first offered to migrant students who "are failing, or at most risk of failing, to meet the State's challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic

achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

LOAs and state level recruiters have access to MSIX and, after obtaining a COE, can determine whether the student qualifies as PFS by the moves documented on the COE and by cross referencing the data with MSIX information on moves and state standardized test scores. However, if the information is not complete in MSIX, moves are documented by the parent, guardian, or youth affidavit on the COE, and assessments are done by the subgrant recipient to gauge the student's academic level to determine if they are failing or at risk of failing state standardized tests. COEs must be submitted to the state data specialist within one week of their obtainment. The state data specialist also cross verifies the MSIX student information to verify PFS status.

## **C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk**

1. Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs (*ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B)*): Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

The SCDE's plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally-operated programs will include the following:

- a. Providing training and on-going technical assistance on federal transition requirements to both the correctional facilities and to the locally-operated programs;
  - b. Conducting an annual, thorough application review to ensure that the required transition components, such as the coordination of responsibilities between the correctional facilities and the locally-operated program, are included;
  - c. Conducting a yearly monitoring process, as well as requiring subgrantee state agencies and LEAs to submit an end-of-year evaluation report to include partnership collaborations between the correctional facilities and the locally-operated programs that include transition activities that specifically address the following:
    - support systems that divert students from the juvenile facility; and
    - the elimination of barriers such as timeliness of academic/psycho-social records transfer and sharing for successful transition in an effort to minimize delays in admissions or re-entry back to the LEA or an alternative education program as appropriate.
  - d. Conducting monitoring, providing technical assistance, and providing or brokering PD opportunities on best practices to ensure the seamless and immediate reentry of students from the facility to the LEA or to an alternative education program as appropriate. Best practices will include the following:
    - Ensuring students are being provided with appropriate levels of instruction in course work while in the facilities to include contextualized and blended learning, and entrepreneurial skills, similar in nature (both the correctional facility and the locally-operated program);
    - Ensuring mechanisms are in place to capture transfer course credit while students are in the facility for when they return back to the LEA or alternative education program as appropriate; and
    - Coordinating services between the correctional facility and the locally operated program, such as individual and family counseling, assistance in accessing drug and alcohol abuse prevention programs, and life and transition skills that are necessary for successful re-entry into the school/home environment as appropriate.
2. Program Objectives and Outcomes (*ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A)*): Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

~~The SCDE will provide on-going technical assistance, conduct monitoring visits, and approve related professional development to ensure that all state agencies and LEAs provide educational services, including special education and related services to 100 percent of the eligible youth identified as neglected, delinquent, or at risk.~~

~~The SCDE will provide on-going technical assistance, conduct monitoring visits, and approve related professional development to ensure that all state agencies and LEAs are equipped to provide services needed to 100 percent of the neglected, delinquent, or at risk (N&D) students served to ensure their successful transitions to further schooling and to prevent them from dropping out of the education process.~~

~~The SCDE will provide on-going technical assistance, conduct monitoring visits, and approve related professional development to ensure that all state agencies and LEAs are equipped to provide services needed to 100 percent of the N&D students served to ensure that IDEA required transition plans are included for special education students fourteen-years old and older.~~

~~The SCDE will provide on-going technical assistance, conduct monitoring visits, and approve related professional development to ensure that all state agencies and LEAs are equipped to provide services needed to 100 percent of the N&D students served to ensure that IDEA required plans are included for special education students older than sixteen and that they include vocational plans.~~

**Goal 1:** To ensure opportunities that improve and increase the academic, vocational, and technical skills of children and youth identified as neglected, delinquent, or at risk (N&D) so that they will become life-long learners and productive members of society.

*Objective 1:* Increase annually, at least by ~~three~~ **one** percent, the number of N&D students who accrue course credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion, secondary school graduation, and or GED attainment;

*Objective 2:* Increase annually, at least by one percent, the number of N&D students who make a successful transition to a regular education program or other educational program operated by an LEA as appropriate;

*Objective 3:* Increase annually, at least by one percent, the number of N&D students who complete secondary school or equivalency requirements; and

*Objective 4:* Increase annually, at least by one percent, the number of N&D served students who participate in post-secondary education, career and technical education, or employment.

**Goal 2:** Assess the effectiveness of the N&D programs in improving educational outcomes based on pre-assessment and post-assessment results.

*Objective 1:* Ensure that correctional facility and locally operated programs design formative and summative assessments to ensure individual student outcomes that inform the following indicators:

- the number of students accruing credits for grade promotion;
- the number of students participating in CATE programs
- the number of students transitioning back into an LEA program;
- the number of students graduating from high school or obtaining a GED; and
- the number of students employed or entering post-secondary education after receiving a diploma or GED.

*Objective 2:* Use the results of formative and summative assessments from all of the above to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D programs in improving students' achievement in academic, vocational, and technical skills.

*Objective 3:* Use the assessment results and outcomes to provide technical assistance and PD that inform goal attainment and areas of program improvement.

## **D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction**

1. Use of Funds (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)): Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Title II, Part A state-level funds will be used to procure and to use a comprehensive online data management system designed to collect data related to teacher evaluation. Specifically, student growth measures collected within the teacher evaluation system will determine the degree to which students grew academically and to which they grew around identified standards. The data management system will generate professional practice and student growth overall effectiveness ratings at the LEA level, which allows school leaders to plan for meaningful and targeted PD related to domains and indicators to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and school leaders. Specific domains of the teacher evaluation system address the teacher's ability to identify students with specific needs, including those with disabilities, EL, GT students, and students with low literacy levels. The domains also provide specific strategies for effective instruction based upon the needs of such students. Specifically, the Planning Domain informs the degree to which teachers design and plan instruction that is appropriate and meaningful for all students, analyze and reflect on student performance to determine student progress, and use results of these analyses to guide future planning and instruction. The Instruction Domain informs the degree to which teachers implement instructional practices that target and accommodate all students, analyze and reflect on the impact of the instruction on student learning, and use results of these analyses to differentiate instruction based upon student needs. The rubric provides a growth model for teachers in these areas.

Additionally, as part of the Student Learning Objective (SLO) process, teachers must be able to identify students with specific needs, including those with disabilities, EL, GT students, and students with low literacy levels. Teachers must identify academic supports provided to these students, implement best instructional practices, monitor their progress towards learning goals, and determine the degree to which the learning goals were met. A Professional Growth and Development Plan will be implemented based upon the results of the SLO process. All of this data will be collected and analyzed through the online data management system. By collecting evaluation data around instructional indicators, as well as around student growth measures, this system will help to improve student achievement in classrooms across the state of South Carolina.

2. Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E)): If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

Title II, Part A state-level funds will be used to procure and use a comprehensive online data management system designed to collect differentiated evaluation data to include teacher practice performance on four levels, principal ratings on leadership standards, and measures of student growth. LEAs will have comprehensive data to make human capital management decisions related to hiring effective teachers and school leaders, placing teachers in leadership positions, and supporting the development of teachers and school leaders to improve equitable access. Additionally, the differentiated levels of professional



performance within the teacher evaluation system and the collection of student growth measures support the state's definition of "ineffective," allowing the state to monitor and support LEAs in ensuring all subgroups, including low income and minority students, have equitable access to effective teachers.

In addition, Title II, Part A LEA funds (allowable up to three (3) percent) will be used to enhance equitable access to effective teachers by increasing leadership opportunities for excellent educators without removing them entirely from the classroom. The need for leadership opportunities was cited as a major cause of turnover by educators interviewed during development of the *South Carolina State Plan for the Equitable Distribution of Excellent Educators*. In response, the SCDE's Office of Educator Effectiveness and Leadership Development is developing a South Carolina Teacher Leader Model focused on valuing teacher expertise, fostering collegiality, and increasing teacher retention for the purpose of enhancing student growth and opportunity. Title II, Part II LEA allowable funds will be used to finish building, to pilot, and to implement the state model. This effort will support and is parallel to work being done in the Office of Educator Effectiveness around instructional support and with the Office of School Transformation's work with schools under CSI or TSI.

3. System of Certification and Licensing (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B)): Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

State law (S.C. Code Ann. § 59-5-60 and § 59-25-110) gives authority to the SBE to formulate and administer a system for the examination and certification of teachers and school leaders through the adoption of rules and regulations.

Educators enter the profession and become certified in South Carolina through various approved pathways including traditional college- or university-based teacher preparation programs, alternative certification pathways, and the work-based certification program CATE teachers. Requirements for certification include, but are not limited to, completion of an approved preparation program, successful scores on the state-adopted subject area and pedagogy examinations, and federal and state criminal records checks.

The majority of newly certified teachers in the state have completed a traditional teacher preparation program at one of South Carolina's thirty colleges and universities with educator preparation programs or an out-of-state traditional preparation program that meets South Carolina's certification requirements as outlined in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-51 (2017).

In addition to traditional preparation programs, South Carolina also prepares and certifies teachers through the following approved non-traditional or alternative routes: the Program for Alternative Certification of Educators (PACE), Teach for America (TFA), the American Board for the Certification of Teaching Excellence (American Board), Teachers of Tomorrow, Adjunct Instructor, Advanced Fine Arts, and Montessori. With the exception of American Board, which is authorized by state statute and with the exception of Teachers of Tomorrow, which is authorized in regulation, all other alternative routes are approved by the SBE. The PACE, TFA, Advanced Fine Arts, and Montessori pathways require intensive training institutes and seminars, as well as coursework. Teachers prepared through alternative routes must meet the same examination and background report requirements as their traditionally-prepared colleagues. These revised guidelines will require candidates seeking entry into non-

traditional programs to meet comparable program admission requirements as must candidates entering traditional preparation programs. Additionally, revisions will include clinical experience requirements for non-traditional providers that may be job-embedded, but will require mentoring, support, and feedback by the provider as candidates enter the classroom.

South Carolina teachers may add content area fields or specialized endorsements to their educator certificates by meeting the specific requirements for each option outlined in Guidelines and Requirements for Content Area Add-on Certifications and Endorsements approved by the SBE (2015).

To qualify for South Carolina's work-based certification pathway for teachers of CATE courses, candidates must demonstrate successful work experience in the specific field and either an industry certification or a successful score on the state content and performance-based assessment in the particular CATE certification area. Additionally, these educators must successfully complete a series of training institutes and the ACT WorkKeys.

South Carolina has a two-tiered certification system for teachers with certificates being issued at the initial or professional level. Beginning educators are issued an initial educator certificate (or equivalent alternate route or work-based credential) and may advance to a professional educator certificate upon meeting all state requirements for advancement, including successful completion of the induction and summative evaluation requirements of South Carolina's system for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT), as outlined in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-205.1 (2013).

The tiered certification system for elementary and secondary principals is established in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-64 (2014) which specifies the requirements for individuals seeking certification as a school administrator through a traditional university-based program approved for certification purposes or through South Carolina's alternative pathway for school administrators. The majority of newly certified school principals in South Carolina have completed a traditional preparation program at one of the state's eleven universities with approved school leader preparation programs or at an out-of-state traditional preparation program that meets South Carolina's certification requirements as outlined in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-51 (2017). To enter the three-year alternative pathway leading to certification as an elementary or secondary principal, a candidate must demonstrate at least three years of leadership experience comparable to that of a school leader, must be offered employment as an assistant principal, and must be recommended for program participation by the district's superintendent.

To advance from Tier 1 to Tier 2 principal certification, school leaders must successfully complete the state's Principal Induction Program (PIP) during the first year of employment as a school principal and earn a rating of Proficient or Exemplary on South Carolina's Program for Assisting and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP) during their second year of employment as a school principal.

4. Improving Skills of Educators (*ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J)*): Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

### **English Learners**

The SCDE will continue to improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to identify ELs and to provide instruction based on these needs through professional learning opportunities (PLOs). PLOs related to ELs are provided on a state level each year based upon a needs assessment completed by Title III directors each spring. Part of Title III funds may be spent on PD) for teachers, principals, and school leaders. In some cases, PD is a requirement for districts that are in Improvement Status due to State Title III audit findings. LEAs that register for PD opportunities must provide a list of participants and, upon arrival, participants must sign in at the PD event. This sign-in is kept as a record of attendance by the state. The SCDE monitors LEAs on a three-year rotation, and evidence of participation and implementation of PD is part of the monitoring tool used. If LEAs are not participating or implementing strategies learned during PD, the SCDE will provide technical assistance as needed. The PDs are structured to provide teachers with opportunities to earn recertification credits. Additionally, PD regarding ELs are designed to provide teachers and administrators with an advanced understanding of evidence based ELs strategies that improve teaching skills and improve student academic achievement. As part of the ongoing PD, LEAs receive strategies to increase parent and community involvement for ELs. The SCDE will provide ELs support to LEAs through annual development and implementation of PLOs, both regionally and in specific LEAs, based on data collected from teachers and administrators across the state from a Title III survey completed each spring, as well as from monitoring results and requests for specific assistance.

Below is a list the PD opportunities currently offered through the SCDE's Office of Federal and State Accountability (Title III Team):

- A series of best practice workshops and PD opportunities that meet the unique challenges of the changing South Carolina ELs population – the SCDE sponsors the series to provide LEAs with support and guidance. Topics include the following: WIDA Standards Training, as well as Advanced WIDA Training; Newcomer Training based upon the Department's Newcomer Toolkit; a writing workshop for meeting academic language challenges in the content areas; multi-sensory grammar for ELs; RTI for ELs and planning appropriate accommodations and assessments for ELs with a focus on differentiation. The state-sponsored PD series is annual and on-going.
- Memos and emails from the Department giving guidance about identification and service to ELs are provided annually to all LEAs. This guidance is shared in the fall of each year to all Title III coordinators responsible for administering programs and services for ELs.
- Leadership meetings are held each fall and spring to disseminate information to stakeholders. These meetings are used to support education and community leaders responsible for administering programs and services for ELs and to support ESOL teachers and administrators who are responsible for meeting student needs. The training and information provided at these meetings includes regulatory and special education principles.
- PLOs for LEA test coordinators and alternate assessment coordinators on testing ELs – training is provided annually to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations
- State-adopted standards, screener, and assessment for ELs – the SCDE has adopted the WIDA standards as our current English language development standards. In

addition, the SCDE has secured the WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT) as the statewide screener and ACCESS 2.0 as the statewide ELP assessment. Training is provided annually for these standards, screeners, and assessments.

- State monitoring document to ensure LEA compliance related to identification and assessment of ELs per state and federal guidelines – the SCDE monitors LEAs on a three-year rotation and has developed a statewide compliance document that is used to ensure LEAs are meeting state and federal guidelines for ELs. This document is updated and provided to LEAs annually as part of the semi-annual leadership meetings.

Please refer to <http://ed.sc.gov/policy/federal-education-programs/esea-title-iii/>.

### **Students with Disabilities**

The PLOs offered reflect state and federal priorities, policies, procedures, and laws, and are all strategically geared to improve educators' knowledge and practice around statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as reflect evidence-based practices and the latest knowledge on the provision of special education and related services to students with disabilities. The activities are accessible, collaborative, evidence-based, intellectually rigorous, and aligned with high-quality standards and adult-learning principles. The opportunities are designed to promote improvement in participant behavior and student achievement.

Topics for PLOs are chosen based on the following:

- Needs assessments through initiatives, such as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and surveyed general education (GE) and parents during the IDEA program monitoring process;
- Open calls for proposals for conferences such as the annual Research to Practice Institute;
- In response to stakeholder input through a variety of sources such as the ombudsperson, parents, and legislators; and
- LEA requests—LEAs can request technical assistance or PLOs by completing a web-based form available at [https://scde.formstack.com/forms/leasop\\_request\\_for\\_assistance](https://scde.formstack.com/forms/leasop_request_for_assistance).

### **Monitoring and Tiered Support**

Per federal requirements under the IDEA, the SCDE makes annual determinations based on compliance and performance indicators for each LEA and SOP to ensure students are receiving appropriate services. These determinations include the evaluation and identification of students with specific learning needs. Based on these determinations, LEAs and SOPs are provided tiered support. The SCDE also performs regular monitoring activities to ensure that LEAs and SOPs are meeting the requirements of both federal and state regulations and statutes regarding the education of students with disabilities. The timeline is annual, as required. In this process, both technical assistance and PD needs are determined to meet the unique needs of LEAs and SOPs.

### **PD and Technical Assistance**

The SCDE provides ongoing technical assistance and PD opportunities for special educators, administrators, related service providers, early interventionists, and others instructing and supporting students with disabilities. The SCDE is responsible for the development and coordination of programs that may include assistive technology,

projects, committees, and events designed to improve professional practices and to help educators develop and apply the knowledge and skills necessary to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities from pre-k to adult education in South Carolina. The specific topics and skills vary as do the continuum of students with disabilities within the state. Descriptions of how the SCDE improves the skills of educators include, but are not limited solely, to the following.

- The SCDE provides PLOs on accessibility for all students, compliance with 504 and 508, and on working with students with sensory impairments to ensure that instruction is accessible. The timeline is annual.
- The SCDE provides PLOs for first and second-year special education directors, as well as for district finance officials, on an ongoing basis. This training provides extensive, requisite knowledge on implementing special education programs within LEAs and SOPs. The timeline is annual.
- The SCDE provides fall and spring leadership meetings to support education and community leaders responsible for administering programs and services for students with disabilities. The training and information provided at these meetings cover regulatory and special education principles. The timeline is the fall and spring semester of each school year.
- The SCDE provides an annual summer institute that offers PLOs to special and general education (GE) teachers, school, district administrators, and higher education representatives on an array of subjects, such as instructional practices, standards, technical guidance, behavioral supports, inclusion, learning strategies, preschool, compliance, and transition (including student leadership and self-determination in coordination with the requirements of the WIOA). The timeline is the summer of each school year.
- The SCDE partners with the state's leading colleges and universities to assist qualified individuals in obtaining the following: (a) add-on, alternative, or initial licensure in special education, (b) advanced certification in speech-language pathology, or (c) national board certification as a behavior analyst. The timeline is annual.
- The SCDE provides virtual PLOs for literacy educators and other relevant personnel in the area of identification, intervention, and evidenced-based practices for students with reading disorders. The timeline is annual.
- The SCDE provides extensive resources, including family and community resources, via its special education webpages. The timeline is annual.
- The SCDE, using implementation science and Leading by Convening theory, has created and supports multiple state-level communities of practice which provide tiered PD, supports, and services to LEAs in the areas of preschool inclusion, sign language interpreting, post-secondary transition, behavioral supports and interventions, and services for students with sensory impairments. The annual timeline runs through 2021.
- The SCDE, through the mechanism of the IDEA SSIP, provides PD, supports, and services to LEAs in the areas of data-driven decision making, universal design for learning, community and family engagement, instructional practices in literacy including interventions and supports, and differentiated instruction. The timeline is annual through 2020.
- The SCDE provides PLOs to district test coordinators and alternate assessment coordinators on testing students with disabilities. The timeline is annual.

For more information, please refer to <http://ed.sc.gov/districts-schools/special-education-services/programs-and-initiatives-p-i/>

### **Students with Low Literacy Levels**

As part of the Read to Succeed Team in the SCDE's OELL, the CDEP/Early Learning Team will improve the skills of teachers, principals, and other school leaders in identifying and providing instruction based on needs for students with low literacy levels by the following means:

- Providing professional learning sessions for early childhood educators on improving instructional practices in evidence-based early childhood curricula with focuses on early literacy ongoing during the school year and when requested by districts.
- Providing ongoing technical support to schools providing full-day pre-K in the CDEP program to ensure that at-risk children are enrolled in high quality programs during the school year and when requested by districts.
- Providing annual and ongoing PD for 4K and 5K educators focused on administering the literacy readiness assessments and analyzing the data to provide differentiated instruction for all students.
- Providing ongoing on-site monitoring visits and support to ensure that the pre-K teachers maintain literacy-and language-rich classrooms during the school year and when requested by districts.
- Providing professional learning and support for educators on the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation Tool (ELLCO) for building district and school capacity in supporting pre-K teachers in continuous quality improvements when requested by the district.
- Providing a state monitoring document to ensure LEA compliance with state guidelines. The SCDE monitors LEAs annually and has developed a statewide compliance document that is used to ensure LEAs are meeting state guidelines for CDEP. This document is updated and provided to LEAs annually.
- Providing a link on the OELL's webpage for LEAs and schools to request information and resources to assist students in becoming proficient readers and writers. Please see the following link: <http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/early-learning-and-literacy/additional-information-and-assistance/>.

The SCDE's Read to Succeed Team will improve the skills of teachers, principals, and other leaders in identifying and providing instruction based upon needs for students with low literacy levels by the following means:

- Providing ongoing technical assistance in support of the development and implementation of LEA and school reading plans, including on-site support and written comments.
- Providing annual technical assistance in support of establishing and operating effective summer reading camps, including on-site support.
- Providing ongoing guidance regarding the use and interpretation of data from state mandated and appropriate alternative assessments for all students as early as possible to reduce the number of students retained in third grade and to increase the number of students exiting high school college-and career-ready.
- Providing monthly PLOs for school-based literacy/reading coaches focused on improving instructional practices in their respective schools.

- Providing ongoing on-site support to literacy/reading coaches focused on collecting and analyzing data to provide differentiated instruction for all students, both during the school year and when requested by LEAs.
- Providing ongoing on-site support to teachers focused on analyzing data to plan and to differentiate instruction, both during the school year and when requested by LEAs.
- Facilitating on-line PLOs focused on improving instructional practices in all content areas for teachers during the school year and when requested by LEAs.
- Providing ongoing on-site support to school principals and district administrators in support and implementation of LEA and school reading plans during the school year and when requested by LEAs.
- Providing on-site PLOs as determined by a needs assessment for summer reading camp teachers to improve reading achievement.
- Providing on-site support during summer reading camp focused on the implementation of evidenced-based instructional practices.
- Using a state monitoring document to ensure compliance of LEAs as it relates to the Read to Succeed Act of 2014 (Act 284), S.C. Code Ann. § 59-155-110, *et seq.*, the SCDE monitors LEAs annually to ensure they are meeting state guidelines for Read to Succeed literacy plans (LEA and school) and school-level reading coaches.
- Publishing and posting an annual report to the SCDE webpage to report the effectiveness of implementation of Read to Succeed and to report strategies and actions towards meeting the goal that 95 percent of all students in each LEA at each grade are reading proficiently.
- Providing a link on the SCDE's webpage for LEAs and schools to request information and resources to assist students in becoming proficient readers and writers. Please see the following link: <http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/early-learning-and-literacy/additional-information-and-assistance/>.

For additional information, please refer to <http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/early-learning-and-literacy/read-to-succeed1/>.

### **Students Who Are Gifted and Talented**

During fall 2017, the SCDE will provide an adaptive presentation series for LEAs and schools to use in training teachers and administrators in the identification of students who are academically and artistically GT. The PD series will emphasize the core belief that GT students come from diverse backgrounds and may also be disabled. This series will be published in the 2017 *South Carolina Gifted and Talented Best Practices Manual* (fall 2017). Additionally, the SCDE will provide presentations around the state on GT identification (fall 2017) and offer PLOs for LEA leaders of GT programs (ongoing). The SCDE will provide GT support to LEAs through annual development and revision of resources and development and implementation of PLOs, both regionally and in specific LEAs, based on data collected from teachers and administrators across the state. Resources and PLOs are evaluated at the following levels: new learning acquired by participants, participants' plan for application of new learning in the classroom, and impact on student learning.

The SCDE provides state grant-funded GT endorsement classes for teachers and administrators annually. The titles of these graduate courses are the *Nature and Needs of the Gifted Learner* and an *Introduction to Curriculum and Instruction for Teaching Gifted and Talented Students*. Annually, more than 200 teachers and administrators participate in these courses.

Additionally, the SCDE will provide PLOs for teachers, school counselors, and administrators regionally and virtually on meeting the learning and the social emotional needs of gifted learners (2018–19 school year). The SCDE, in conjunction with South Carolina Educational Television (SCETV), offers video resources for educators (currently available). These videos focus on meeting the academic, artistic, and social emotional needs of GT students. The SCDE will develop additional resources in a variety of formats (2017–18 and subsequent years).

For additional information, please refer to <http://ed.sc.gov/instruction/standards-learning/advanced-academic-programs/gifted-and-talented/>.

5. Data and Consultation (*ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K)*): Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

The SCDE is committed to ongoing consultation with diverse stakeholders in implementation of its state plan. At least two times per year, the SCDE will convene the ESSA Committee of Practitioners, an external stakeholder group with membership that is consistent with ESEA 2101(d)(3) and other ESSA consultation requirements. This committee includes teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals (including organizations representing such individuals), specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, parents, community partners, and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of ESEA titles. These stakeholders will be drawn from advisory groups within the various federal ESSA Title grant programs, school districts, and communities. The meetings will be held at a designated physical setting or will be held virtually. The focus of these meetings will be to engage in meaningful consultation related to Title II, Part A, but also related to all ESSA titles. Meaningful consultation includes sharing of data and the SCDE's implementation work, but also the generation of stakeholder input (which will be documented and shared across relevant offices in the agency) and the coordination of ESSA activities with other related strategies, programs, and activities being conducted in the State. The ESSA Committee of Practitioners' membership, protocols, meeting agendas, documentation, and sharing of stakeholder input will be led by the SCDE Office of Federal and State Accountability with support from other relevant offices across the agency.

~~Each year,~~ When the state-level reporting of disproportionalities present in LEAs and schools are published (as described under Title I, Part A, Section 5 of this plan), the SCDE ~~will convene the~~ State Human Capital Team (also described under Title I, Part A, Section 5 of this plan) ~~to~~ will examine data results, assess the effectiveness of state and federally funded strategies supporting educators' ability to improve student achievement and the equitable distribution of educators, and plan new or revise strategies in response to that assessment. ~~One goal of this team will be to coordinate the state's activities—both state and federally funded—for educator improvement and the equitable distribution of educators with other related strategies, programs, and activities being conducted by the state.~~ Annually, State Human Capital Team data and strategies will be shared with ~~an the~~ the SCDE-sponsored external stakeholder group annually ESSA Committee of Practitioners for meaningful consultation and to seek advice regarding how best to improve the state's strategies to meet the purposes of Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A of ESSA.



6. Teacher Preparation (*ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M)*): Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

The SBE requires that all teacher preparation programs meet the standards established by the national accreditation association with which the state has a partnership agreement. South Carolina has transitioned to a partnership agreement with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Through the rigorous standards and expectations of the CAEP accreditation process, educator preparation providers (EPP) must demonstrate the impact of their graduates on P–12 student learning and must determine the degree to which graduates and their employers are satisfied with the quality of their preparation programs. In addition, the SBE, through the SCDE and the state's Commission on Higher Education (CHE), has authority to develop and implement a plan for the continuous evaluation and upgrading of standards for program approval of undergraduate and graduate educator preparation programs in South Carolina.

Through participation in the Council of Chief State School Officers' Network (CCSSO) for Transforming Educator Preparation, South Carolina has convened stakeholder groups to redesign the state's EPP Guidelines, slated to go to the SBE for approval in 2017. These redesigned guidelines will bring greater focus on outcome and accountability measures for EPPs, both traditional and non-traditional or alternative route. Specific changes in the draft revision of the EPP Guidelines will require candidates seeking entry into non-traditional programs to meet comparable program admission requirements as candidates entering traditional EPPs. Additionally, revisions will include clinical experience requirements for non-traditional providers that may be job-embedded, but will require mentoring, support, and feedback by the provider as candidates enter the classroom. These pending updates to South Carolina's EPP Guidelines include common standards and comparable program admission, reporting, and accountability measures for traditional and non-traditional routes to certification. These accountability measures, accreditation decisions, and ratings generated through state review will be used to provide enhanced consumer information to potential candidates as they choose an EPP and will provide South Carolina's public schools and LEAs with enhanced information regarding the quality of preparation of teacher candidates by the state's EPPs.

## **E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement**

1. Entrance and Exit Procedures (*ESEA section 3113(b)(2)*): Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

The SCDE convened a committee that included six members from varying districts across the state and two SCDE staff members from the Office of Federal and State Accountability. The committee was representative of the geographic diversity of the state, and included districts with different EL population sizes and demographics, as well as urban and rural districts. The committee looked at a variety of indicators including survey results from South Carolina school districts across the state to determine that South Carolina will rely on the state Home Language Survey as well as the students' performance on the state's adopted summative WIDA Screener and ACCESS Assessment for EL entrance and exiting decisions. Entrance into the state's EL program will be based on the State HLS and summative WIDA Screener results. Exit from the EL program is based on a standardized, common score on ACCESS. Further explanation can be found below. In addition, EL's who meet the State Exit Criteria will additionally be monitored for a period of four years.

The SCDE requires all LEAs to administer a HLS to all students in grades K–12. According to the HLS results, if the student's first language is not English or if a language other than English is spoken in the home, the LEA must administer, within the first thirty days of school or within ten days from a later enrollment of the child, an initial language proficiency-screening test. The SCDE has selected the WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test as the statewide screening test and the W-APT for 5K. The results of the HLS and the WIDA Screener or the W-APT determine if the student is to enter an EL program. To exit from an EL program, the student must score a 4.4 overall composite and no lower than a 4.0 on each of the four domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) of the WIDA Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State (ACCESS) 2.0 Exit Exam. This test is administered annually to all ELs until they reach the state exit criteria. Exited students are required by the SCDE to be monitored for four years to ensure that they are assimilated into the regular school environment without assistance. During the monitoring period, the students can be given additional services if required to maintain their EL proficiency.

2. SEA Support for English Learner Progress (*ESEA section 3113(b)(6)*): Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:
  - i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
  - ii. The challenging State academic standards.

The SCDE Title III program office provides extensive federal program and fiscal training and monitoring through PD, desk reviews, and onsite monitoring visits. LEAs are monitored for compliance with Title III through periodic desk reviews and onsite monitoring visits on a three-year rotation or based on specific need or concern. The SCDE has developed an

onsite Title III Monitoring Instrument that is shared with each LEA yearly at the Title III Coordinators meeting. The Monitoring Instrument addresses student proficiency, immigrants, EL Program design and implementation and Parental Participation. The SCDE coordinates its training with the appropriate offices within the agency, including the Office of Federal and State Accountability, the Office of School Transformation, the OSES, the OCTE, the Office of Finance, the Grants Program, and the Office of Auditing Services. Trainings on program requirements and compliance issues include both LEA program and finance staff, and have proven to be successful in coordinating LEA efforts, as well as in providing support for LEAs in meeting the challenges of the state's growing EL population.

The SCDE will assist LEAs in meeting long term goals established under ESEA by offering PD opportunities to improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to identify EL and to provide instruction based on these needs. In addition, PLOs will be based on feedback from LEAs and data collected from progress monitoring at the state level to ensure LEA progress in meeting ELP goals and academic standards.

3. Monitoring and Technical Assistance (*ESEA section 3113(b)(8)*): Describe:

- i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
- ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

The SCDE Title III program office provides extensive federal program and fiscal training and monitoring through PD, desk reviews, and onsite monitoring visits. LEAs are monitored for compliance with Title III through desk reviews and onsite monitoring visits on a three-year rotation.

If LEAs are found by the SCDE to require support based on poor performance during onsite monitoring or desk reviews should the supports funded by their Title III plan not be effective, the State Title III Coordinator will work with the director of the Office of Federal and State Accountability to provide a series of actions that will help the LEA to improve. These actions will be individualized based on LEA and school areas of need for technical assistance. Such actions may be mandatory attendance at SCDE sponsored PD, further development of LEA EL Plan, individualized assistance in lesson planning and PD from the State EL Coordinator. At any time, LEAs may request additional technical assistance from the Title III office. Whenever feasible and appropriate, technical assistance will be prioritized to support any schools identified for CSI or TSI under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19.

The SCDE coordinates its training with the appropriate offices within the agency, including the Office of Federal and State Accountability, the Office of School Transformation, the Office of Special Education Services, the Office of CATE, the Office of Finance, the Grants Program, and the Office of Auditing Services. Trainings on program requirements and compliance issues include both LEA program and finance staff, and have proven to be

successful in coordinating LEA efforts, as well as in providing support for LEAs in meeting the challenges of the state's growing EL population.

If LEAs are found by the SCDE to require support based on poor performance during onsite monitoring or desk reviews, the State Title III Coordinator will work with the director of the Office of Federal and State Accountability to provide a series of actions that will help the LEA to improve. These actions will be individualized based on LEA and school areas of need for technical assistance. At any time, LEAs may request additional technical assistance from the Title III office. Whenever feasible and appropriate, technical assistance will be prioritized to support any schools identified for CSI or TSI under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19.

## **F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants**

1. Use of Funds (*ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)*): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

The SCDE will use the one percent of funds allowable for state use for state administration and for technical assistance activities. Currently, ninety-nine percent of the program funding will be allocated to LEAs via formula subgrants, which will be administered in the same proportion as the prior year's Title I, Part A allocations. The percentage given to LEAs may change depending on future funding levels. LEAs will be required to identify objectives and desired outcomes for activities for which the subgrant is awarded and will have to report progress and conduct evaluations of the activities.

2. Awarding Subgrants (*ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B)*): Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with *ESEA section 4105(a)(2)*.

Subawards will be distributed to LEAs by formula grant and no LEA will receive less than \$10,000 upon approval of a state application designed to ensure compliance to relevant federal and state laws. If South Carolina receives an insufficient allocation to meet *ESSA section 4105(a)(2)*, LEA allocations will be ratably reduced per *ESSA section 4105(b)*.

## **G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers**

1. Use of Funds (*ESEA section 4203(a)(2)*): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

Consistent with the requirements of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Centers (CCLC) program, the SCDE awards funds to subgrantees that must be used to raise student achievement through activities that take place primarily after school but can also take place before school, during intercession, on the weekend, and during the summer. South Carolina received approximately \$16.7 million in 2016 and funded approximately 120 LEAs, non-profits, institutions of higher education, and other organizations to operate 21st CCLC in approximately 150 schools statewide. Centers located in rural, urban, and suburban areas of the state, serve more than 12,000 students. The centers are established to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that

- provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students in high-poverty areas and those who attend low-performing schools meet state and local student performance standards in core academic subjects such as reading, math, and science;
- offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities; drug and violence prevention programs; counseling programs; art, music, and recreation programs; technology education programs; and character education programs, that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
- offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

The SCDE will continue to use funds reserved for state-level activities to support the evaluation of the state's administration of the 21st CCLC program and to provide technical assistance and PD to subgrantees related to evidence-based strategies for meeting the academic and social needs of low performing students, for improving program quality, and for strengthening community collaborations. Additional PD topics will be determined in connection with the recommendations from the statewide evaluator.

2. Awarding Subgrants (*ESEA section 4203(a)(4)*): Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding CCLC funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

The SCDE awards funds in a manner that is consistent with the federal authorizing statute and non-regulatory guidance (<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stccllc/legislation.html>). Eligible applicants must propose to serve primarily low-performing students who attend schools that have a free/reduced lunch rate of 40 percent or higher. The SCDE holds a 21st CCLC subgrant competition annually to ensure that as many students as possible who need supplemental academic and career-related assistance receive services. The annual competition, which runs from January–April, is open to LEAs, community-based organizations, non-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, and for-profit

entities. Using a maximum per-student-cost of \$2,000, an applicant may request a minimum of \$50,000 and a maximum of \$200,000, annually.

To increase the likelihood that subgrantees will actually help students meet state and local academic standards, particularly in reading and math, applicants are required to identify and describe in the project description section of their application narrative, the curriculum and strategies that will be implemented to address the academic deficiencies of the proposed participants. Additionally, the following criteria have been established by the SCDE:

- *Academic Focus*—A proposed 21st CCLC is required to operate in a manner that maximizes the program’s impact on the academic performance of participating students. Applicants must propose academic instruction and enrichment activities to help students meet and exceed state and local standards in core content areas such as reading, mathematics, and science.
- During periods of direct academic instruction, a student-to-teacher ratio of 10:1 or less is required. The SCDE encourages using certified instructors in core subject areas to ensure instruction that correlates with the South Carolina academic standards.
- Applicants that propose not to employ certified educators to provide academic instruction must prove that the non-certified staff responsible for providing academic instruction are knowledgeable of the South Carolina academic standards and have the necessary subject matter credentials.

As required by Section 4201(b)(5) of ESSA, the SCDE convenes a grant review panel to review and rate applications to determine the extent to which the applications meet the 21st CCLC program requirements. The grant review panel is comprised of impartial, diverse individuals with experience in various backgrounds, including education (secondary and postsecondary), business, and community partnerships. The SCDE solicits qualified reviewers using a variety of approaches, including an “open call” posting on the agency’s website, recommendations from the SCDE staff and past reviewers, and invitations to select organizations (i.e., the SC Afterschool Alliance, the SC Association of Nonprofit Organizations, and the SC Literacy Association). Selected reviewers are required to participate in a three-hour training session to learn more about the 21st CCLC program and, more specifically, the SCDE’s definition of and expectations for high-quality afterschool programs. Each application is read and scored by three peer reviewers, and the individual scores from each reviewer are averaged to determine the final score. Awards are made based on the rank order of final scores, from highest to lowest. To the extent practical, subgrants are distributed equitably among the geographic areas of the state. To increase geographic equity, priority points are awarded to applicants that propose to serve an eligible school or schools in a South Carolina LEA that is not currently receiving 21st CCLC subgrant funds or has not been served with such funds for a period of one or more years.

## H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

1. Outcomes and Objectives (*ESEA section 5223(b)(1)*): Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

Federal funds are allocated by the United States Department of Education (USED) only to SEAs “that have applications submitted under section 5223 approved.” (see ESEA section 52213), who in turn make sub-grants to eligible LEAs based on Average Daily Attendance and poverty census data. Each LEA defines how each objective in its project application will be measured and what the outcome will be. LEA activities are to be discussed in number 2 below. The State Title V Coordinator in the SCDE’s Office of Federal and State Accountability will review the outcomes for success submitted by the districts at the end of each school term. Anticipated outcomes are based on the individual activities of the district’s plan. These activities will vary from district to district **and will follow the SCDE’s mission, which is that all South Carolina students graduate prepared for success in college, careers, and citizenship. The state’s program objective is to provide support for LEAs receiving Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) funds to ensure that eligible LEAs utilize funds in one or more of the allowable categories (listed under 2 below) to enhance the LEAs instructional program and to increase student achievement. State level funds will be used for activities such as the following:**

- Providing support for Title V, Part B, coordinator;
- Federal program monitoring of subgrantees;
- Providing PD offerings either centrally or regionally; and
- Providing annual training for LEA coordinators.

2. Technical Assistance (*ESEA section 5223(b)(3)*): Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities be used described in ESEA section 5222(a).

LOCAL AWARDS.—Grant funds awarded to local educational agencies under this subpart shall for any of the following:

- Activities authorized under part A of Title I.
- Activities authorized under Part A of Title II.
- Activities authorized under Title III.
- Activities authorized under parts A and B of Title IV.
- Parental involvement.

All offices that oversee grant programs provide differentiated technical assistance regarding the administration of the grant to schools and districts, depending on their individual needs as determined by their grant applications and by direct communication between LEA and the SCDE. **Technical assistance will be provided to LEAs to assist them in implementing the RLIS activities described in individual program applications. Federal program monitoring, PD offerings, and annual training opportunities will be offered to all subgrantees. Technical assistance may be provided in-person, by telephone, by webinar, or by recorded presentation.**

Based upon the needs of regions, LEAs, and individual schools, the Office of Standards and Learning develops, implements, and evaluates research-based PLOs to improve the capacity of teachers and LEAs to raise student achievement. Based on data-based needs



assessments, assistance is provided statewide, regionally, by LEAs, and in individual schools.

Whenever feasible and appropriate, technical assistance will be prioritized to support any schools identified for CSI or TSI under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19.

## **I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B**

1. Student Identification (722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

### **Strategies:**

South Carolina LEAs identified 14,360 students eligible for McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento) programs during the 2015–16 school year, which represents a 36 percent increase in students identified over the past five years. The identification and needs assessment of homeless children and youths in the state is accomplished through a variety of methods. The SCDE ensures that LEAs are responsible for locating and identifying children and youth experiencing homelessness by requiring that LEAs and local liaisons engage in the following activities:

- Appoint a staff member as the McKinney-Vento LEA liaison who has the capacity to carry out the duties described in the law, including the identification of homeless children and youth, preschool children, and OSY.
- Disseminate public notice of McKinney-Vento rights in locations frequented by parents, guardians, and unaccompanied youth to increase awareness of rights and self-referrals.
- Ensure that all school personnel (school administrators, teachers, counselors, social workers, attendance clerks, registrars, transportation, nutrition, front desk, and support staff) receive PD on the indicators of homelessness and the protocol for referring possible homeless parents/students to the local liaison.
- Raise the awareness of school personnel and service providers of the effects of short term stays in a shelter, double-up living, and other challenges associated with homelessness.
- Create community awareness by reaching out to other state and local agencies, service providers, and advocates to collaborate and coordinate the identification of homeless children and youth.
- Upon identification, complete intake/needs assessment to ensure that students are provided all necessary district services and connected to all supports needed.
- Coordinate the provision of services under this subtitle through outreach and coordination activities with other entities and agencies; and with local social services agencies and other agencies or entities providing services to homeless children and youths and their families, including services and programs funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The SCDE strongly encourages LEAs and local liaisons to engage in the following activities:

- Use a Student Residency/Occupational Survey form to screen for homeless and migratory eligibility. This tool can be used in school enrollment packets and upon new enrollment to identify students, and is available in English and Spanish.
- Provide information to parents by creating a welcoming and supportive environment for parents to disclose their homeless situation.
- Reach out to children and youth to ensure that they perceive school as a safe place to disclose family challenges and homelessness.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will continue to provide services and activities to improve the identification of homeless children and youths (including preschool-aged homeless children) and assessment of their needs. The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will engage in the following activities:

- Post a compiled contact list of all current South Carolina McKinney-Vento LEA liaisons on the SCDE website. The list is available to the public and is shared electronically with LEA liaisons, Title I directors, Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children/Youth program coordinators, Continuums of Care, and other advocates.
- Develop and implement PD programs for liaisons, other LEA personnel, SCDE staff, other state and local agencies, service providers, and advocates to improve the identification of homeless children and youth and to heighten awareness of, and the capacity to respond to, specific needs in the education of homeless children and youth.
- Coordinate and collaborate with other SCDE programs that serve homeless students (i.e., Title I, Part A, Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children/Youth Program, IDEA, early learning, transportation, and nutrition) on PD and outreach to increase identification.
- Coordinate and collaborate with other federal, state, and local agencies, service providers, and advocates (i.e., Head Start, SCDSS, HUD) to create community awareness to increase identification. Develop interagency partnerships.
- Conduct statewide needs assessment. Use data to determine if the SCDE and LEAs are under-identifying homeless children and youth.
  - Targeted grants were developed to assist the McKinney-Vento LEA liaison in LEAs with a high poverty index and low percentage of identified McKinney-Vento students, with the technical assistance and funding to improve community awareness, identification, enrollment, and assessment of the needs of homeless children and youths. Past subgrantees were required to attend two PD sessions and the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (NAEH CY) Conference to build the skills and knowledge to coordinate a successful McKinney-Vento program.
- Complete an annual needs assessment to evaluate the needs of children and youth experiencing homelessness. The results of the needs assessment, including the greatest needs identified, will inform PD, technical assistance, and monitoring.
- Children and youth experiencing homelessness will be flagged in PowerSchool by their LEA McKinney-Vento liaisons. The state coordinator will communicate to LEA liaisons the number of McKinney-Vento students identified in PowerSchool following each quarterly upload to the SCDE to ensure accuracy in the data. LEA liaisons and the state coordinator will review the data for accuracy. After it is certified by the SCDE, the data will be submitted to EdFACTS for federal reporting.
- Monitor all LEAs to ensure compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act, including the identification of, and assessment of needs of, homeless children and youth. Monitoring will be based upon a risk assessment that considers underreporting, compliance complaints, and years of experience of the McKinney-Vento Liaison among other criteria.

The SCDE and LEAs will develop, review, and revise policies to remove barriers to the identification, enrollment, and retention of homeless students in school, including barriers due to fees, fines, and absences. In light of reauthorization, the McKinney-Vento state

coordinator will collaborate with SCDE's General Counsel to ensure no new barriers exist.

**Timeline:**

Identifying homeless children and youths and assessing their needs is a continuous process. Identification of students begins during enrollment and monitoring and assessing students continues throughout the year.

**Funding Source:**

McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds, as well as any other federal, state, and local funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

2. Dispute Resolution (722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

**Strategies:**

The SCDE provides a time-sensitive, state-level dispute resolution process to review LEA-level decisions regarding the eligibility, school selection, or enrollment of a homeless child or an unaccompanied youth. A copy of the State-Level Resolution Process for Disputes Involving Unaccompanied Youth and Homeless Children (24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs 43-272.2), titled the "Dispute Resolution Procedures," is posted on the SCDE Web site. The current procedures will be reviewed and revised for the 2018–19 school year to comply with ESSA changes; amendments will include

- "eligibility" as a disputable criteria,
- transportation rights for homeless children and youth during the dispute resolution process, pending the final resolution, and
- the provision of technical assistance by the state coordinator to parents and homeless youths to help them navigate the dispute process.

All LEAs are required to adopt procedures for resolving disputes regarding the eligibility, school selection, or enrollment of homeless children and youth that is consistent with the state's Dispute Resolution Procedures. An LEA's dispute resolution procedures are reviewed during monitoring.

Upon receipt of a dispute from an unaccompanied youth, parent, or guardian, the McKinney-Vento state coordinator will send relevant information to the LEA for a written reply due within five business days. The state coordinator will make a final decision within ten business days of receiving the written response from the LEA.

Under no circumstances must resolution of a dispute delay the school enrollment of an unaccompanied youth or a homeless child. Pending resolution, the student shall be immediately admitted to the school in which enrollment is sought, and shall participate fully in all school activities.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator provides PD and technical assistance for LEA liaisons, other LEA personnel, and parents or unaccompanied homeless youths to ensure disputes are handled according to guidelines.

3. Support for School Personnel (722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

Description:

The SCDE's McKinney-Vento state coordinator provides, or arranges for the provision of, training opportunities for all school and LEA personnel to heighten awareness of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including runaway and homeless children and youths in conjunction with PD and conferences offered by various divisions of the SCDE.

Strategies:

These trainings and conferences may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- McKinney-Vento, 101 is offered at a minimum of each fall for new or seasoned liaisons and other interested LEA employees. This training provides an in-depth explanation of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Topics include eligibility, the role of liaisons, school selection, transportation, immediate enrollment, disputes, preschool, runaway and unaccompanied youth, and the specific needs of this population. Other programs, such as Title I, IDEA, higher education, and Head Start also are reviewed.
- An annual statewide PD for liaisons and other interested LEA employees is offered. Continued training will be offered based on attendance, survey results, program changes, and the SCDE's needs assessment indicating areas of concern.
- Bi-annual regional PD, offered in the past, may be reinstated depending on survey results.
- Bi-annual subgrantee meetings are held to cover grants management and the sharing of best practices.
- Presentations/ PD sessions are provided at meetings/conferences administered by other offices and programs within the SCDE, including Title I, Part A, Title I, Part C (Education of Migratory Children/Youth), Title III (ESOL), the OSES, and the Office of Health and Nutrition.
- Presentations/PD sessions are provided to outside agencies and organizations, including the South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council, the South Carolina State Head Start Association, the South Carolina Association of Community Action Partnerships, the South Carolina Coalition for the Homeless (including Continuums of Care), the SCDSS, and the South Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault.
- Liaisons are encouraged to take advantage of online webinars (live and recorded) provided by the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE), NAEHCY, and SchoolHouse Connection. These webinars include printable certificates as evidence of PD.
- The state coordinator provides technical assistance via email and phone calls.
- The state coordinator provides PD and on-site technical assistance upon request.
- The state coordinator will continue to reach out to other offices and agencies to expand PD to increase awareness and collaboration.
- The state coordinator adopts policies and practices to ensure that liaisons participate in PD and other technical assistance activities.

- The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will post materials specific to the needs of homeless children and youths to the SCDE's website. The site will link to the NCHE, the official clearinghouse and technical assistance center for the Department's Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program. A plethora of informational and training materials are available from NCHE, including a Toolkit for LEA Liaisons, online training, webinars, and other materials. NCHE offers free products, including Educational Rights of Homeless Children and Youth posters and brochures for parents, for all LEA liaisons. Additional product needs may be provided by the McKinney-Vento state coordinator upon request.
- One of the duties of the LEA liaison listed under Section 722(g)(6)(A) of the McKinney-Vento Act, is to provide school personnel with PD and other supports. During LEA monitoring, the state coordinator reviews for evidence that school personnel, including the personnel listed, are receiving training to heighten their awareness of the specific needs of runaway and homeless children and youth.

Timeline:

Providing programs and technical assistance to heighten the awareness of school personnel about the specific needs of homeless children and youth and runaway and homeless youths is an on-going process.

Funding Source:

McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds, as well as any other federal, state, and local funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

4. Access to Services (722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures that ensure that:
  - i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;
  - ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and
  - iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, AP, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.
- i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State

Strategies:

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will continue to coordinate and collaborate with Head Start, Early Head Start, and Migratory Head Start programs, federal and state funded preschool initiatives, and with LEAs offering preschool programs to provide information, training, and technical assistance regarding the significant risk homelessness poses on birth-through-preschool-aged children and on the provision of services available for this population. LEAs and childcare agencies will be updated on best-interest school of origin

rights, including transportation for preschool students through the 2015 reauthorization. In cross-agency coordination efforts, the state coordinators for McKinney-Vento and Head Start and staff from SCDSS will present or provide information at each other's annual PD, and invite the other population to the trainings.

The SCDE's OELL coordinates the state's CDEP, a full-day preschool program for at-risk children who are age four by September 1st and who are income eligible (based on eligibility for Medicaid or free/reduced lunch). Through collaboration at the LEA level, a number of slots for McKinney-Vento students are reserved, and homeless children are put at the top of the waiting list if no slots are available.

Though collaboration with the SCDSS following reauthorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG), the state's Childcare Voucher Program has recruited and awarded *more than 1000 childcare vouchers* for McKinney-Vento children and youth. SCDSS permitted certain allowances for families experiencing homelessness and established a point of contact to ensure that applications are reviewed within 48 hours and questions are addressed immediately. With the SCDSS taking the lead, the SCDE McKinney-Vento program and the SCDSS have partnered to promote the availability of vouchers for children experiencing homelessness statewide to a variety of audiences, including the Continuum of Cares, and were asked to present on this successful collaboration at the NAEHCY Conference.

The state coordinator collaborates with the state Head Start Collaboration director on the procedures used to identify and prioritize homeless children for enrollment into Head Start. The S.C. Head Start Census reported 365 McKinney-Vento children were enrolled in Head Start programs statewide by December 1, 2016. McKinney-Vento and Head Start continue to partner on PD, not only to update practitioners, but also to connect McKinney-Vento liaisons with their county's Head Start family advocates. A new development for 2017–18 is that the South Carolina Head Start Association and the SCDE's McKinney-Vento program are pooling financial resources to provide a collaborative training. The outcomes (also listed in the Head Start Collaborative Grant) will include the following: an updated Enrollment, Recruitment, Selection, Eligibility, and Attendance Plan, addressing Head Start and McKinney-Vento amendments, a strategic plan to increase McKinney-Vento students receiving comprehensive services, joint McKinney-Vento/Head Start Technical Assistance Clusters, and increased partnerships between the SCDE and the South Carolina Head Start Association.

South Carolina First Steps to School Readiness (First Steps), a statewide public-private partnership to increase school readiness outcomes for children, was created as a result of the alarming gap in students' preparedness for school success. Each county in the state is served by a First Steps Partnership responsible for meeting local needs and for identifying collaborative opportunities to help our state's youngest learners. BabyNet, First Steps 4K, and Early Head Start are among the programs under the First Steps umbrella. The McKinney-Vento state coordinator collaborates with First Steps to ensure an understanding of the McKinney-Vento Act and an awareness that improving

access to quality child care and early learning can help to buffer children from the challenges and risks associated with homelessness by supporting children's learning and development in safe, stable, and nurturing environments.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator serves on the South Carolina Interagency Coordinating Council to provide input to member agencies regarding the importance of providing services to homeless infants with disabilities.

**Timeline:**

Ensuring homeless children have access to the same public preschool programs administered by the SCDE or LEAs as provided to other children in the state is an on-going process.

**Funding Source:**

McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds, the CCDBG funds, and Head Start funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

- ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies

**Strategies:**

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator provides PD and technical assistance to LEA liaisons and other LEA personnel to ensure that youth meeting McKinney-Vento criteria and youths separated from the public school are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services. McKinney-Vento students who are transferring and reentering school will receive appropriate credits for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed so this will not be a barrier to the enrollment, retention, and success of homeless students. SBE regulation (24 S.C. Code Ann. Reg 43-234) permits South Carolina schools to award and accept high school credit in units of one-fourth, one-half, and a whole.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will develop training and guidance materials for high school counselors and administrators regarding the need to implement dropout prevention and recovery programs aimed at meeting the needs of youths who are homeless. This training will increase awareness of the need for career specialist services to ensure homeless youths receive appropriate credit for full or partial coursework completed in prior schools, provide credit recovery, and share creative scheduling practices for students who transfer.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator also will provide school counselors with training regarding the need to assist all homeless students in preparing for college and careers. Such training will include current fee waivers for exams and college application and the free application for federal student aid (FASFA) for unaccompanied homeless youth. As a new strategy, a Higher Education Network



to support McKinney-Vento students applying and entering college will be developed.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will collaborate and coordinate with statewide graduation initiatives and dropout prevention programs to ensure that the needs of homeless children and youths are adequately addressed within these programs.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will collaborate with the SCDE's Office of Federal and State Accountability to review and revise policies regarding the awarding of full or partial credit to homeless youths who have satisfactorily completed coursework while enrolled in school.

**Timeline:**

Ensuring appropriate credits accrual for children and youth living in transition is an on-going process.

**Funding Source:**

McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

- iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, AP, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels

**Strategies:**

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will collaborate and coordinate with other state and federal programs providing additional educational opportunities, including CATE, GT education, and the 21st CCLCs, athletic directors, etc., to provide an understanding of the important academic and emotional needs of homeless children and youth to include common barriers and solutions to accessing academic and extracurricular activities.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will develop training and guidance to LEAs operating magnet schools, summer schools, CATE, AP courses, International Baccalaureate, online credit recovery, and charter school programs to ensure that homeless children and youths have the same opportunities to enroll and participate in these programs as all other students.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator encourages LEAs to provide opportunities for homeless students to enroll in AP courses, IB programs, dual enrollment programs, GT programs, and other academic programs. LEAs are encouraged to assist homeless students in participating in fine arts programs. LEAs are encouraged to reach out to the local community to provide items needed for participation in extracurricular activities, including athletic gear, musical instruments, and other tools or equipment as necessary.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will collaborate and coordinate with any relevant associations to review and revise policies that may act as barriers to the

full participation of homeless children and youths in extracurricular activities. Section 10 of the by-laws of the South Carolina High School League makes an allowance for eligibility for a student who transfers to another school due to their family's homelessness.

**Timeline:**

Ensuring homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities is an ongoing process.

**Funding Source:**

McKinney-Vento and Title I, Part A funds are used to best leverage resources, maximize services, and minimize duplication of efforts.

5. Strategies to Address Other Problems (722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—
- i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
  - ii. residency requirements;
  - iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
  - iv. guardianship issues; or
  - v. uniform or dress code requirements.<sup>5</sup>

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will continue to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays caused by a lack of documents such as the birth certificate, immunization and other health records, school records, proof of residency or guardianship, or the lack of required clothing, through a variety of methods. Continued training and technical assistance will provide strategies to LEA liaisons and other LEA personnel to ensure that all barriers to the immediate enrollment of homeless children and youth are removed.

Educational Rights of Homeless Students posters inform families and unaccompanied youth of their right to immediate enrollment, even if lacking the items listed under this section. These posters are displayed in every South Carolina school and also in places likely frequented by homeless families.

- i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
- iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;

Liaisons are trained on their rights under FERPA to request and receive school records from the preceding LEA, including all academic records, IEPs, other health records, birth certificate, etc. Liaisons are advised to contact the state coordinator if roadblocks occur. Liaisons understand information can be expedited via phone or fax while waiting on the official records through mail, and that records are not necessary to start the student in

---

<sup>5</sup> Please note that answers to some of these sections overlap; thus, answers are designated by the corresponding romanette.

classes. Liaisons are aware that the state coordinator will assist LEAs with records transfer when address confidentiality is warranted.

LEA liaisons provide thorough training on these mandates and strategies to school and LEA personnel, including registrars and front desk staff, who typically act as enrollment clerks. The state coordinator provides liaisons with a reference booklet created by the NCHE to give to enrollment personnel for understanding the legal guidelines for the immediate school enrollment of children and youth experiencing homelessness.

- ii. residency requirements
- iv. guardianship issues
- v. uniform or dress code requirements

State law (S.C. Code Ann § 59-63-32) provides a way for children and youth who are not in the custody of their parent or legal guardian to register and attend school. If a homeless child or youth is living with a caregiver who is not their “legal” guardian, the school affidavit form will assist with enrollment and grants caregivers the right to educational decisions. These educational decisions may include receiving notices of discipline, attending school conferences, and granting permission for athletic activities, field trips, and other activities as required.

Training includes all provisions of the McKinney-Vento statute and non-regulatory guidance and the ESSA, including the dress code and uniform requirements. This training includes that the provision of uniforms or meeting dress code requirements is an allowable expense under the Title I, Part A homeless reservation and under the McKinney-Vento subgrant. In addition, many liaisons are skilled at attaining supplies, including uniforms or clothing, through donations and Parent Teacher Association/Parent Teacher Organization (PTA/PTO) and other clubs.

- i. requirements of immunization and other required health records
- iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation

State law (S.C. Code Ann. § 44-29-180) offers a thirty-day grace period to allow parents, guardians, and liaisons to submit immunization records. The SCDE has collaborated with the S.C. Department of Health and Environment Control to give access to their online immunization database to school nurses for secure current records for students who do not have them.

LEA liaisons assist with transfer of immunization records from other LEAs or other states, and may schedule or transport the student and parent or guardian to update immunizations if necessary. Additionally, liaisons are informed that the date of birth is on the immunization record, which is provided by the same state agency as the birth certificates.

All LEAs are monitored for compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act guidelines and requirements once every three years, or more frequently based on result of their risk assessment. The McKinney-Vento monitoring instrument addresses compliance with the requirements listed under *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*, in addition to the review of LEA policies and procedures.

6. Policies to Remove Barriers (722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

The McKinney-Vento state coordinator will complete a comprehensive review of state policies and procedures to identify any potential barriers to the identification of homeless children and youths, and the enrollment, attendance, retention, and success of homeless children and youths in schools in the state, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences. If barriers are found, the state coordinator will follow the proper procedures to revise the law. This practice will continue on an annual basis.

The state coordinator provides training and guidance to McKinney-Vento liaisons and LEA staff on an ongoing basis on federal and state laws, regulations, and policies that touch homeless children and youth. If an LEA determines that parts of its policy contain potential barriers to the areas listed under this item, the LEA uses the supremacy clause, which states that federal law trumps state law and state or local policy in the case of conflicting legislation. LEAs are aware of the educational rights assured to children and youth experiencing homelessness, and simply waive requirements for that population. The training includes the requirement to *make accommodations* for homeless students with respect to attendance and discipline issues when the possibility exists that a student's behavior was directly affected by the adverse effects of homelessness. The SCDE is in the process of revising the regulation on student attendance, and has included similar language for approval.

The LEA monitoring protocol includes the requirement that LEAs must review and revise policies and procedures which could act as barriers to the identification of, and enrollment, attendance, participation, and success of homeless children and youth. The state coordinator reviews policies at monitoring.

An SBE regulation (24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-273 (2013)) states that schools may not withhold the transfer of records to a public or private school for fees owed by the student. Students cannot be denied enrollment due to outstanding fees or fines from other districts. Interstate records and transfer issues related to fees and fines are dealt with immediately by the state coordinator.

7. Assistance from Counselors (722(g)(1)(K)): A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

As outlined in *the Profile*, South Carolina students will graduate college, career, and citizenship ready. To assist with this goal, all students, including McKinney-Vento students, participate in a series of IGP conferences beginning in eighth grade. In a collaborative effort, the McKinney-Vento state coordinator and the SCDE school counselor/career specialist liaison will create customized PD for school guidance counselors and career specialists to increase their understanding of awareness regarding the unique needs of the children and youth experiencing homelessness population, and their school staffs' mandated responsibilities to serve this population. This targeted PD will target give school counselors the knowledge and tools to provide

the following direct services to homeless students. ~~the following areas:~~ This PD will be offered at the SC Annual McKinney-Vento Conference and at state school counselor conferences or workshops.

Counselors will assist McKinney-Vento students

- with the IGP process, in addition to other procedures and tools covered in the CDGCPM, as described on pages 89-90.
- ~~The requirement for counselors to assist homeless youths in~~ by ensuring they receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework.
- ~~The requirement for counselors to provide~~ with credit recovery.
- ~~The requirement for counselors to assist students who meet the McKinney Vento definition of homeless~~ with advice and preparation to improve the student's readiness for college, including any additional supports, resources, and fee waivers available to motivate eligible students to pursue post-secondary education.
- ~~The requirement for counselors to ensure that~~ who are also unaccompanied youth, understand are informed of their status as independent students for college financial aid.
- ~~The requirement for counselors to assist homeless youths~~ in completing FASFA applications.

As a new strategy, the state coordinator will develop a McKinney-Vento Higher Education Network which will include a single point of contact in the Financial Aid offices of all South Carolina public colleges and universities. These contacts will be trained to support homeless youth in applying for education, financial aid, and will assist students to overcome common barriers and support their academic success.

## Appendix A: Exit Survey Data from SCDE ESSA Meetings

The SCDE held four statewide stakeholder meetings between October 27, 2016, and May 11, 2017, to inform stakeholders, to generate stakeholder input around critical questions, and to elicit feedback on drafts of the South Carolina ESSA Consolidated State Plan. Meetings were held in varied formats to ensure accessibility to all stakeholders in the state, as well as to generate the conversation necessary to inform SCDE work. Over two thousand diverse stakeholders were invited in accordance with §1111(a)(1)(A) of ESSA.

Table 1. Date, Times, Format, Number of Attendees, and Number of Respondents Completing the SCDE Exit Survey for SCDE ESSA Meetings

Date	Time	Format	Number of Attendees	Number of Respondents
October 27, 2016	6:00–8:00 p.m.	Virtual	208	--
YouTube of Oct. 27	--	Virtual Recording	469	--
November 21, 2016	1:00–4:30 p.m.	Face-to-face	56	47
March 24, 2017	3:30–5:00 p.m.	Virtual	76	15
May 11, 2017	2:00–5:00 p.m.	Face-to-face	38	23

A brief exit survey was provided in a hard copy and virtual format at the November 21, March 24, and May 11 meetings. The exit survey had an overall response rate of fifty percent. The survey was not distributed during the initial October 27 meeting, which was a general introduction to ESSA and the SCDE's process for writing the South Carolina Consolidated State Plan. As of July 21, 2017, the online recording of the October 27 meeting, available on YouTube, had 469 views.

During the November, March, and May meetings, attendees were asked to consider and discuss specific questions related to development of the South Carolina ESSA Consolidated Plan. Survey results shown in Table 2 show that more than half of the survey respondents had not attended previous meetings. Between seventy and ninety percent of respondents had read one of the drafts of the South Carolina ESSA Consolidated State Plan posted on the SCDE website during development. As time passed from November to May, exit survey data show that greater percentages of attendees discussed ESSA with a friend or family member, with a work colleague, or with an SCDE staff member.

Table 2. Percentage of Respondents Answering Yes to Prior Knowledge Questions on Stakeholder Meeting Exit Surveys

Question	November 21	March 24	May 11
Attended or listened to previously held ESSA meeting(s).	40.4%	46.7%	39.1%
Read the SCDE framework document posted on the SCDE website.	73.9%	86.7%	73.9%
Read the federal law as published by the US Department of Education.	43.2%	80.0%	52.2%
Discussed ESSA with a friend or family member.	74.5%	80.0%	87.0%
Discussed ESSA with a work colleague.	89.1%	86.7%	91.3%
Discussed ESSA with an SCDE staff member.	54.3%	46.7%	65.2%

Each stakeholder meeting included an initial whole group introductory session. Overall, exit survey data provided in Table 3 show that stakeholders' understanding of ESSA, the SCDE's role, stakeholders' role, critical questions, the process being used to develop the plan, and where information about ESSA could be accessed was improved by stakeholder meetings.

Table 3. Respondent Answers to the Question "What is your understanding of each of the following items after today's whole group introductory session?" by Percentage

Question Item	Greatly Improved or Improved	Somewhat Improved	Not Improved
Overall ESSA requirements	75.6%	20.7%	3.7%
The SCDE's role under ESSA	85.4%	12.2%	2.4%
My role as a stakeholder under ESSA	76.6%	18.5%	4.9%
The critical questions to be answered as part of developing South Carolina's ESSA state plan	75.9%	20.5%	3.6%
The process being used to develop South Carolina's ESSA state plan	79.8%	19.0%	1.2%
Where to get information about ESSA	81.7%	14.6%	3.7%

Soliciting information related to stakeholder perception of the agency and its process for developing the state plan during stakeholder meetings was important to the SCDE. Table 4 shows that most respondents agreed that the SCDE's process incorporated stakeholder input, that the SCDE would pay attention to stakeholder input, and that the SCDE is open to new or different ideas.

Table 4. Respondent Answers to Statements about the SCDE

Statement	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Disagree or Disagree
The SCDE's process for developing South Carolina ESSA state plan incorporates stakeholder input.	93.9%	6.1%
The SCDE will pay attention to <u>my</u> input in developing South Carolina's ESSA state plan.	86.3%	13.8%
The SCDE is open to new or different ideas in developing South Carolina's ESSA state plan.	88.4%	11.7%

The SCDE asked two open-ended questions at the end of the exit survey:

1. Describe one stakeholder suggestion that you felt should definitely be incorporated in South Carolina's ESSA state plan, and
2. Share one very important concern or question related to ESSA.

Stakeholder suggestions centered around six main themes: accountability (17 responses), wrap-around services and staff (11 responses), ESSA funding (6 responses), curriculum concerns (4 responses), educators (4 responses), and family/community involvement (4 responses).

Stakeholder concerns and questions could be grouped in similar themes, but stakeholders' questions in each category were often provocative.

*ESSA Funding*

- Will it be adequately funded?

*Wrap-Around Services and Staff*

- How are you going to include school nurses in the SSIP?
- What is the role of the school librarian and school library in this planning document?

*Educators*

- How do we evaluate the attractiveness of a district to highly effective educators and leaders?
- How do we gain equity across school districts regarding effective teaching and learning?

*Big Picture*

- How long will this initiative last?
- How will the change of administration at the federal level affect ESSA at the state/local level?



## Appendix B: South Carolina Stakeholder Outreach

In accordance with § 1111(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the ESSA, the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) consulted with key stakeholders including, but not limited to, the Governor, members of the State legislature and the State Board of Education, local educational agencies, representatives of Indian tribes located in South Carolina, teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, advocacy groups, community organizations, students and parents while developing its ESSA State Plan. The SCDE attended more than 120 external stakeholder meetings between October 21, 2015, and October 11, 2017, at which information about ESSA was shared.

Type of Meeting	Meeting Location	Presenter(s)	Date	Description
Western Piedmont Education Consortium	Greenwood, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/21/2015	Discussion on ESEA Reauthorization
Presentation	River Bluff School	Sheila Quinn	12/10/2015	PowerPoint about ESSA generally
Meeting of Statewide Accountability Model Work Groups #1, #2, #3	Lexington Two School District Office	Sheila Quinn	1/15/2016	Overview of the work, group assignments, and a timeline for implementation.
Presentation of Power Point	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	1/21/2016	Presentation by University of South Carolina researcher (Diane Monrad) on climate surveys
World Class Knowledge and Skills	Lexington Two School District Office	Sheila Quinn	1/25/2016	Collaboration with the SCDE, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC), and the South Carolina Association for School Administrators (SCASA) Roundtable
Presentation	1411 Gervais St. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	1/27/2016	Transform SC - ESSA presentation
Statewide Accountability Model Work Group #1 Meeting	Hampton Inn Irmo, SC	Sheila Quinn	2/3/2016	Continuation of Statewide Accountability Model Tasks

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
World Class Opportunities – Work Group #2	Lexington Two School District Office	Sheila Quinn	2/12/2016	Developed outcome-based, measurable school success indicators specific to each school level and to the district that showcase students’ opportunities outside summative assessments to expand their knowledge, skills, and characteristics to meet the Profile of the SC Graduate.
Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	2/23/2016	Statewide Accountability Model Work Group #2
Superintendents Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	2/26/2016	Group of 10 district superintendents - Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
World Class System and School Quality – Work Group #3	Lexington Two School District Office	Sheila Quinn	2/29/2016	Explored valid ways to use metrics that include but are not limited to the following: (1) school and district climate/culture indicators; (2) System quality review through AdvancED; (3) Personalized Learning Rubric
Presentation	Beaufort School District	Sheila Quinn	3/2/2016	Update regarding accountability model, testing updates, insights about best practices, and highlights about Profile of Graduate
SCASA Superintendents Roundtable	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	3/3/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
Webinar	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	3/8/2016	Discussion of major provisions of ESSA related to the education of EL released by Council of Chief State School Officers
SCASA Testing and Accountability Roundtable (TAR) Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	3/17/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Commission on Higher Education (CHE) Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	3/18/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
Focus Groups Meeting	Baxter Hood Center Rock Hill, SC	Sheila Quinn	3/23/2016	Catawba Region Board meeting & focus groups - Accountability Model - discussion and feedback
ESSA Webinar	111 Research Dr. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	4/1/2016	SC School Boards Association (SCSBA) webinar
EOC Superintendent Meeting	Gaffney, SC	Sheila Quinn	4/14/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
EOC Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	4/15/2016	Meeting to review and amend methodology issues related to 3-8 and high school EOCEPs.
World Class Knowledge and Skills – Work Group #1	Lexington Two School District Office	Sheila Quinn	4/18/2016	Meeting to complete the group assignment for the Statewide Accountability Model
SCASA Superintendents Roundtable	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	4/21/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
Superintendents Accountability Work Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	4/29/2016	Group of 10 district superintendents - Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
Meeting with Superintendent of Lexington School District One	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	5/4/2016	Accountability Model - feedback
EOC Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	5/6/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
CHE Presentation	CHE	Sheila Quinn	5/19/2016	Presented Accountability Model
SCASA TAR Roundtable	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	5/19/2016	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Superintendents Accountability Work Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	5/20/2016	Group of ten district superintendents - Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
ESSA Academic Standards & Assessment Work Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	6/22/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
EOC	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	6/27/2016	EOC - Accountability discussion
Superintendents Workgroup	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	6/30/2016	Group of ten district superintendents - Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
ESSA Plan Work Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/1/2016	Meeting to work on the Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools section of the plan.
ESSA Accountability Sub-Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/1/2016	Review of each member's area of focus in the Accountability Section and identify work.
Superintendents Accountability Work Group	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	7/7/2016	Accountability and feedback
SC Ready	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/11/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
EOC	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/11/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
SC Ready	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/11/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
EOC Presentation	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/12/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
ESSA Academic Standards & Assessment Work Group	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/14/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
ESSA Workgroup Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/19/2016	Accountability Model Power Point - discussion, comments, contributions
ESSA Notice of Proposed Rudlemaking	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/19/2016	Quinn Webinar - PP on Accountability Model with Q&A

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
(NPRM): Assessments Webinar				
ESSA ELP Test Metrics for Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/26/2016	ESSA ELP Test Metrics for Accountability discussion and feedback
School Improvement Advisory Group Meeting	Richland One Bus Shop Career Development Center	Jen Morrison	7/26/2016	Discussion of state equity plan and ESSA – solicitation and feedback
Superintendents Accountability Work Group	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	7/28/2016	Accountability Model discussion and feedback
CATE Accountability Metrics for ESSA	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/2/2016	CATE accountability metrics for ESSA plan discussion/feedback
Superintendent Accountability Work Group	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	8/4/2016	ESSA plan and feedback
EOC meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/4/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
ESSA Workgroup Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/8/2016	Work Group meeting - discussion and feedback
Meeting on Accountability Study	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/17/2016	Meeting with Superintendent from Lexington School District One (Dr. Karen Woodward) to get feedback on ESSA plan
Stakeholder Meeting	SCDE	Scott Winburn Karla Hawkins Sheila Quinn John Payne Liz Jones Roy Stehle Anne Pressley Julie Fowler	8/23/2016	Work group leaders presented their particular component parts of the plan to leaders of state educational associations and legislative staff.
SCSBA School Law Conference	Charleston Marriott, Lockwood Blvd.	Sheila Quinn	8/26–8/27 2016	ESSA overview

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Accountability Presentation-Monday Mini	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/29/2016	Delivered ESSA Plan to agency
SCASA Superintendents Retreat	Hilton Hotel Columbia, SC	Karla Hawkins Sheila Quinn	9/1/2016	SCASA Superintendents Retreat - discussion of Accountability Plan and feedback
Superintendents Workgroup	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	9/6/2016	ESSA plan and feedback
EOC/SCDE Retreat	SCSBA	Sheila Quinn	9/14/2016	Accountability discussion at annual retreat.
SCASA TAR meeting	1616 Richland St. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	9/15/2016	Discussion regarding Accountability Model
South Carolina Council on Competitiveness Meeting	Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) Training Room	Emily Heatwole Scott Winburn	9/28/2016	General discussion on ESSA in South Carolina
Superintendents Workgroup	Hampton Inn – Irmo, SC	Sheila Quinn	9/30/2016	Superintendents' Symposium - Input and final recommendations
National Urban League and Columbia Urban League	Columbia, SC	Molly Spearman Karla Hawkins Scott Winburn	9/30/2016	SCDE ESSA discussion with Susie Savsdra (National Urban League) and James T. McLawhorn, Jr. (Columbia Urban League)
Superintendents Roundtable	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	10/6/2016	Superintendents Accountability points - discussion
Calhoun Co. School District	St. Matthews, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/17/2016	Presented Accountability Model
Superintendent's Roundtable	SCASA	Molly Spearman	10/17/2016	SCDE update on ESSA State plan
Meeting on Accountability Study	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	10/18/2016	Met with Superintendent from Lexington School District One (Dr. Karen Woodward) to get feedback on ESSA plan
School Improvement Advisory Group	SCDE – Rutledge Conference	Jen Morrison	10/26/2016	Discussion of state equity plan and ESSA – solicitation and feedback

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Meeting	Center			
ESSA Statewide Stakeholder Meeting	Virtual	Molly Spearman and Various SCDE Leadership	10/27/2016	Virtual meeting to provide updates regarding ESSA State plan, as well as an opportunity for key stakeholders to provide feedback
OEC Principals Presentation	Chester, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/27/2016	Old English Consortium - ESSA
Meeting with Governor's Office	Governor's Office	Scott Winburn Emily Heatwole Roy Stehle Karla Hawkins Sheila Quinn	11/3/2016	Governor Haley's staff and SCDE staff - ESSA consultation
EOC Subcommittee Meeting on Accountability	Blatt Bldg. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	11/7/2016	Presentation to EIA Subcommittee of EOC on Accountability
AdvancED Workday Meeting	Columbia Conference Center	Sheila Quinn	11/11/2016	Accountability update for next day conference attendees
ESSA and Charter Conference	Marriott Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	11/16/2016	Public Charter School Alliance of SC conference - ESSA update
SCASA TAR Accountability Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	11/21/2016	TAR accountability discussion
ESSA Statewide Stakeholder Meeting	SCDE	Various SCDE Leadership	11/21/2016	Statewide stakeholders - solicitation and feedback
EOC and EOC Subcommittee Presentation	Blatt Bldg. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	11/28/2016	Presentation to EOC Subcommittee - Accountability
Priority Schools Quarterly Meeting	EdVenture Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn Latoya Dixon	11/30/2016	School Improvement Accountability Model solicitation and feedback
Accountability Draft Meeting	Winthrop University	Sheila Quinn	12/16/2016	Present Accountability draft

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
SCASA Roundtable	SCASA	Sheila Quinn	1/19/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
SC Chamber of Commerce meeting	SC Chamber	Sheila Quinn	1/19/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
School Improvement Advisory Group Meeting	Richland One Bus Shop Career Development Center	Jen Morrison Scott Winburn Latoya Dixon	1/24/2017	Discussion of state equity plan and ESSA – solicitation and feedback
SCASA – AP Roundtable	121 Westpark Blvd, Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	1/24/2017	Presentation of ESSA Draft – solicitation and feedback
Anderson 1 School District	Williamston, SC	Sheila Quinn	2/1/2017	Presented updates to Superintendents on Accountability Draft
Fairfield Old Alternative HS	1226 US 321 Winnsboro, SC	Sheila Quinn	2/3/2017	Presented UGP, Diploma Pathways & Accountability Model updates
EOC Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	2/13/2017	Formative Assessment Presentation
South Carolina Advisory Council on Education of Students with Disabilities	Lexington School District Two – District Office	John Payne	2/17/2017	Routine Office of Special Education Services update
Lunch & Learn - ESSA Update	SCDE	Scott Winburn Roy Stehle	2/22/2017	Development and implementation of ESSA State plan
Francis Marion University	Florence, SC	Sheila Quinn Julie Fowler	2/23/2017	Discussed Summary Info on each indicator approved & reported under ESSA to evaluate school performance.
SC Council for Exceptional Children Conference	Myrtle Beach, SC	Scott Winburn	2/25/2017	Update on ESSA including key implications for students with Disabilities
Hampton 2 - Board of Trustees	Estill, SC	Sheila Quinn	3/1/2017	Discuss merged accountability system & new tiering system of department support



<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Olde English Consortium	Rock Hill School	Sheila Quinn	3/2/2017	ESSA Accountability
Focus Schools Quarterly Meeting	Samuel A. Heyward Career and Technology Center Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn Latoya Dixon	3/2/2017	ESSA implications on school improvement-Comprehensive Support and Improvement/Targeted Support and Improvement
Priority Schools Quarterly Meeting	Ed Venture Columbia, SC	Latoya Dixon Francina Gerald	3/8/2017	ESSA & School Improvement-Tiers of Technical Assistance for Comprehensive Support & Intervention Understanding Tools for selecting Evidence Based Intervention and Strategies using Evidence for ESSA & What Works Clearing House
EOC Focus Groups Meeting	Richland Library, Garner's Ferry Rd. Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	3/24/2017	EOC Focus Groups – Accountability Discussion
ESSA Statewide Stakeholder Meeting	Virtual	Various SCDE leadership staff	3/24/2017	Statewide stakeholders - solicitation and feedback
Title I Rules and Regulations Meeting	Medallion Center, Columbia, SC	Scott Winburn Sheila Quinn	3/28/2017	Overview/update on ESSA
SC Association of School Psychologists Sponsored Panel Discussion – ESSA Town Hall	Castle Heights Middle School Rock Hill, SC	Scott Winburn Lisa McCliment	3/30/2017	Q&A regarding ESSA updates and key implications
Williamsburg County ESSA Town Hall Meeting	Kenneth Gardner Elementary School Kingstree, SC	Scott Winburn	4/6/2017	Q&A regarding ESSA updates and key implications
SC Social Studies Supervisors Association	Richland 2 Columbia Place Mall	Sheila Quinn	4/21/2017	Accountability details and discussion

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
School Improvement Advisory Group Meeting	SC Department of Archives and History Building	Jen Morrison Scott Winburn	4/24/2017	Discussion of state equity plan and ESSA – solicitation and feedback
ESSA Statewide Stakeholder Meeting	SCDE	Various SCDE Leadership Staff	5/11/2017	Statewide stakeholders - solicitation and feedback
Pee Dee Superintendents Consortium	Francis Marion University	Sheila Quinn Representing Molly Spearman	5/25/2017	Presented SCDE recommendations
EOC Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	6/9/2017	Accountability Discussions
Lunch and Learn- The New Accountability System	SCDE (recorded and live)	SCDE Employees	6/22/2017	Discussion of new accountability model
EOC Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/5/2017	ESSA Decision Points
EOC Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/11/2017	ESSA Decision Points
EOC Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	7/20/2017	EOC accountability & Assessment presentation
EOC Retreat	Clemson University	Sheila Quinn Emily Heatwole	7/31/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
State Support Network ESSA Consolidated State Plan Development CoP	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/3/2017	Unitary Accountability Systems under ESSA – questions and answers
Presentation	Saluda, SC	Sheila Quinn	8/11/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback from Saluda County School District Principals
Presentation	Rock Hill, SC	Sheila Quinn	8/14/2017	EOCEP Presentation
SCDE Meeting with Senator Greg Hembree	SCDE	Senior Staff	8/18/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback
Meeting with Governor’s Office	SCDE	Molly Spearman Emily	8/22/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
		Heatwole Sheila Quinn Daniel Ralyea		SCDE representatives met with Jay Wolfe and Mark Plowden (Governor's Office staff) and Melanie Barton and Kevin Andrews (EOC staff)
Meeting with Governor's Office	SCDE	Molly Spearman Emily Heatwole Sheila Quinn	8/30/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback  SCDE representatives met with Trey Walker, Mark Plowden, and Jay Wolfe of the Governor's Office
Webinar	SCDE	Sheila Quinn Daniel Ralyea	8/31/2017	ESSA State Plan Development CoP - Implementing Data Dashboards
EOC Subcommittee Meeting	SCDE	Sheila Quinn	8/31/2017	Discussion involving ESSA Decision Points SCDE presentation with Melanie Barton of the EOC
Presentation	Gaffney, SC	Sheila Quinn	9/1/2017	Accountability Model - solicitation and feedback from Cherokee County School District Superintendent
Superintendents Symposium	Charleston, SC	Sheila Quinn	9/7/2017	Presentation of ESSA updates to SCASA
EOC Public Hearing	Blatt Building Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	9/15/2017	Public Hearing on Accountability
SCASA Superintendents Roundtable Meeting	Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/05/2017	Accountability Model
Meeting with the Governor's Office	Columbia, SC	Molly Spearman Sheila Quinn	10/09/2017	Accountability Model  SCDE representatives met with Trey Walker, Mark Plowden, and Jay Wolfe of the Governor's Office
EOC Meeting	Columbia, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/09/2017	Accountability Model
SBE Meeting	N. Charleston, SC	Sheila Quinn	10/10/2017	Accountability Model
School Districts: Colleton; Bamberg 1 and 2; Barnwell 19, 29, & 45; Hampton 1	Colleton School District	Sheila Quinn	10/10/2017	Accountability Model

<b>Type of Meeting</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Presenter(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Orangeburg School Districts: 3; 4; and 5	Orangeburg 5 School District	Sheila Quinn	10/11/2017	Accountability Model

## Appendix C: SCDE Response to Stakeholder Feedback

At the start of plan development, the SCDE assigned communication and consultation responsibility to a single staff member in the Office of General Counsel. This ESSA contact was also a member of the agency's overall ESSA Management Team supported by the Office of Federal and State Accountability.

Stakeholder feedback was solicited throughout development of the South Carolina ESSA Consolidated State Plan through a number of methods. Stakeholders were able to:

1. Access information, resources, and the SCDE most current drafts at <http://ed.sc.gov/newsroom/every-student-succeeds-act-essa/>, then submit comments to a general comments email inbox.
2. Communicate directly with the designated ESSA staff contact via email or telephone,
3. Connect and talk directly with SCDE staff at meetings attended by the SCDE as outlined in Appendix B, or
4. Attend and provide feedback at one of three statewide stakeholder meetings held between November 2016 and May 2017 as outlined in Appendix A.

While SCDE staff and writers were often able to see and hear stakeholder feedback informally as participants in the consultation process, stakeholder feedback from the three statewide meetings and from the general comments email inbox were compiled for more formal review and response by ESSA workgroup leaders and members to provide documentation and a record of SCDE response.

Feedback from the three statewide stakeholder meetings was organized by the ESSA workgroups defined by the USED's initial template and by critical questions relevant to key decision points in the state's plan. Compiled stakeholder feedback documents and SCDE responses can be accessed on the SCDE's ESSA webpage at <http://ed.sc.gov/newsroom/every-student-succeeds-act-essa/>. Summaries of stakeholder feedback and SCDE response by workgroup are presented in this appendix.

### *Accountability*

SCDE staff began engaging with stakeholders in 2015 to begin preparation for a legislated merge of state and federal accountability systems by the 2017–18 school year. ESSA's requirements and stakeholder feedback informed the 2017 legislative process of the South Carolina General Assembly, which in the end, defined the state's accountability system in the EAA. Stakeholder feedback around accountability under ESSA varied and often focused on select details from one stakeholder to another in response to the SCDE's proposed methodologies and questions. Clarification for specific questions can be found on the SCDE response document on the SCDE website. Changes instituted as a result of stakeholder feedback included modification of the state goals, adoption of a lower n-size for purposes of transparency, expansion of pathways to college and career readiness, inclusion of psychometric reliability and validity in the procurement requirements for the state's student engagement survey, and adoption of a descriptive school rating scale (versus an A through F scale). It was clear to the SCDE from stakeholder input during the plan development process that a strong education component will be needed to help stakeholders understand and make effective use of growth measures in the new state accountability system.

### *Standards and Assessment*

Stakeholder feedback and concerns around assessment seemed to focus on the usefulness and preponderance of current state assessments. In response to stakeholder concerns, the SCDE has worked with the South Carolina General Assembly to reduce testing in science and social studies. During ESSA stakeholder meetings, the SCDE floated the option of using Algebra 2 for end-of-course testing in high school. This generated a great deal of discussion and feedback, both positive and negative; as a result, the SCDE continues to seek stakeholder input and is having potential vendors propose development of a new Algebra 2 test in the state's latest request for proposal (RFP) for high school testing. The SCDE is also

beginning investigations into whether it can eventually administer interim assessments or performance tasks in place of summative assessments under the new state/federal accountability system and Act 94.

#### *School Intervention and Support*

ESSA requires that states identify and provide support for CSI and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). Language in the South Carolina ESSA Comprehensive State Plan outlines clear identification and exit criteria across three-year cycles and tiered intervention and support systems. Stakeholder feedback and concerns in response to the plan drafts seemed to center around the identification cycle, accountability metrics, interim monitoring within a three-year cycle, implications for principal and teacher support, funding, and transition from the current identification moratorium into active identification under ESSA. Clarification to specific questions can be found on the SCDE response document on the SCDE website and did not generally require changes to the state's ESSA plan, though some clarifications were added to meet stakeholders' expressed needs.

#### *Supporting Excellent Educators*

The SCDE School Improvement Advisory Group (SIAG), established under the 2015 *South Carolina State Plan for the Equitable Distribution of Educators*, has provided a strong stakeholder feedback loop around SCDE work with human capital and ensuring that high poverty and minority children in South Carolina are not taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. As a result, a great deal of stakeholder feedback was in discussion even prior to the November, March, and May ESSA stakeholder meetings. Stakeholder feedback and concerns in response to the SCDE's ESSA drafts seemed to center around implications of alternative route teacher preparation and suggestions that the SCDE provide human capital support and intervention in districts, provide opportunity for teacher leadership and incentives, help districts make themselves more attractive, ensure pay equity, address the professional learning needs of educators, and provide teachers with training to work with students from poverty. Some stakeholder suggestions – like those around increasing teacher pay – are legislatively controlled. Also, funding for supporting excellent educators under ESSA is limited, so the SCDE has taken a conservative approach to what has been included in the plan. In response to stakeholders, the state ESSA plan earmarks Title II, Part A funds for work in developing teacher leadership opportunities in the state and Title I, Part A funds for the SCDE to provide human capital data, support, and interventions in districts. The SCDE has also included increased support through resources and PD for educators focused on the needs of GT students, students with low literacy levels, students with disabilities, and EL. While mentioned in the ESSA state plan, teacher retention issues are being addressed in South Carolina through varied channels outside the ESSA plan including the Recruitment and Retention Task Force authorized by Proviso 1.92, incentives for rural districts provided through CERRA, and the SCDE and CERRA's participation in the State Human Capital Alliance.

#### *Supporting All Students*

Stakeholder feedback and concerns centered around the need for wrap-around care and services, utilization of special staff within schools like school nurses, and coordination and communication of special services. Stakeholder input did not generally require changes to the state's ESSA plan, though some clarifications were added related to school district liaisons and their duties to coordinate and collaborate with state agencies as well as form partnerships with community organizations. The SCDE is committed to increasing district liaisons' awareness of existing resources in the state, best practices in targeting and providing interventions, and other SCDE programs, like those for children of military families offered by the OCTE. In regard to EL, the SCDE has added professional learning opportunity offerings and revised the exit criteria and HLS required to meet USED and OCR regulations.

## Appendix D: Measurements of Interim Progress

*Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and ELP, set forth in the State's response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.*

### A. Academic Achievement

State Achievement Goal 1 = 90 percent at Level 2 or higher. South Carolina has an intense push to move students out of the bottom achievement category where college and career opportunities are significantly diminished.

State Achievement Goal 2 = 70 percent at Level 3 or higher. South Carolina will push for all students to be on grade level and thereby on track to college or career readiness.

**Chart 1- GRADE 3, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

Subgroups grade 3, Reading/ ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>43.6%</del> 42.1%	70%	<del>77.6%</del> 73.9%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>31.6%</del> 30.45	70%	<del>70.1%</del> 66.05	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>16.5%</del> 13.85	70%	<del>42.3%</del> 35.3%	90%
English Learners	<del>31.2%</del> 30.1%	70%	<del>69.0%</del> 65.15	90%
Caucasian	<del>57.4%</del> 55.5%	70%	<del>86.6%</del> 83.4%	90%
Hispanic	<del>34.0%</del> 33.1%	70%	<del>71.6%</del> 67.3%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>67.7%</del> 67.6%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>89.1%</del> 89.1%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>26.7%</del> 24.5%	70%	<del>66.6%</del> 61.4%	90%
Native American	<del>39.2%</del> 37.7%	70%	<del>74.0%</del> 68.1%	90%

**Chart 2- GRADE 3, MATHEMATICS**

Subgroups grade 3, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>53.5%</del> 52.5%	70%	<del>78.3%</del> 77.8%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>42.4%</del> 41.5%	70%	<del>71.3%</del> 70.9%	90%

Subgroups grade 3, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
Children with disabilities	<del>25.3%</del> 22.0%	70%	<del>48.8%</del> 46.1%	90%
English learners	<del>46.8%</del> 43.6%	70%	<del>74.3%</del> 72.7%	90%
Caucasian	<del>67.1%</del> 66.2%	70%	<del>87.3%</del> 87.0%	90%
Hispanic	<del>47.2%</del> 44.4%	70%	<del>75.4%</del> 74.0%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>77.6%</del> 80.6%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>92.5%</del> 93.5%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>35.9%</del> 34.3%	70%	<del>66.5%</del> 64.7%	90%
Native American	<del>52.9%</del> 46.2%	70%	<del>77.2%</del> 79.5%	90%

Chart 3- GRADE 4, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups grade 4, Reading/ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>43.4%</del> 40.9%	70%	<del>75.6%</del> 70.5%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>30.9%</del> 28.9%	70%	<del>67.1%</del> 61.1%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>13.1%</del> 10.8%	70%	<del>35.8%</del> 29.5%	90%
English learners	<del>31.4%</del> 30.2%	70%	<del>68.6%</del> 63.5%	90%
Caucasian	<del>56.7%</del> 54.2%	70%	<del>84.9%</del> 81.3%	90%
Hispanic	<del>33.4%</del> 31.9%	70%	<del>70.7%</del> 65.4%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>66.6%</del> 66.6%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>89.2%</del> 88.2%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>26.2%</del> 22.9%	70%	<del>63.3%</del> 55.0%	90%
Native American	<del>47.5%</del> 30.0%	70%	<del>77.9%</del> 60.0%	90%

Chart 4- GRADE 4, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups grade 4, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>46.6%</del> 46.4%	70%	<del>77.2%</del> 75.9%	90%
Economically	<del>34.1%</del> 34.2%	70%	<del>69.4%</del> 68%	90%



Subgroups grade 4, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
disadvantaged students				
Children with disabilities	<del>18.1%</del> 16.0%	70%	<del>44.3%</del> 41.1%	90%
English learners	<del>39.9%</del> 38.8%	70%	<del>73.9%</del> 70.9%	90%
Caucasian	<del>60.7%</del> 60.8%	70%	<del>86.2%</del> 86.0%	90%
Hispanic	<del>39.8%</del> 39.3%	70%	<del>74.6%</del> 72.0%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>74.0%</del> 75.4%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>91.2%</del> 92.1%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>27.5%</del> 26.1%	70%	<del>64.5%</del> 61.5%	90%
Native American	<del>47.7%</del> 33.7%	70%	<del>80.7%</del> 67.9%	90%

Chart 5- GRADE 5, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups grade 5 Reading/ ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>41.1%</del> 38.3%	70%	<del>76.0%</del> 72.0%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>27.5%</del> 25.6%	70%	<del>66.9%</del> 62.4%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>10.2%</del> 7.2%	70%	<del>33.8%</del> 28.4%	90%
English learners	<del>28.8%</del> 28.8%	70%	<del>67.3%</del> 64.1%	90%
Caucasian	<del>54.2%</del> 51.3%	70%	<del>85.6%</del> 82.1%	90%
Hispanic	<del>31.1%</del> 30.4%	70%	<del>69.4%</del> 66.6%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>63.4%</del> 64.2%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>90.0%</del> 87.7%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>23.4%</del> 19.8%	70%	<del>63.0%</del> 57.1%	90%
Native American	<del>36.8%</del> 40.7%	70%	<del>74.2%</del> 71.6%	90%

Chart 6- GRADE 5, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups grade 5, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>44.2%</del> 40.0%	70%	<del>77.0%</del> 72.1%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>31.2%</del> 27.5%	70%	<del>68.9%</del> 62.7%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>13.0%</del> 9.4%	70%	<del>41.7%</del> 32.6%	90%

Subgroups grade 5, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
English learners	<del>38.1%</del> 33.9%	70%	<del>74.0%</del> 68.0%	90%
Caucasian	<del>57.5%</del> 53.5%	70%	<del>86.0%</del> 82.7%	90%
Hispanic	<del>37.5%</del> 33.5%	70%	<del>74.1%</del> 68.6%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>70.2%</del> 72.6%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>90.8%</del> 91.6%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>25.1%</del> 20.2%	70%	<del>64.0%</del> 56.1%	90%
Native American	<del>43.4%</del> 38.4%	70%	<del>75.8%</del> 71.2%	90%

Chart 7- GRADE 6, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups grade 6, Reading/ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>40.9%</del> 39.7%	70%	<del>79.4%</del> 76.3%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>27.1%</del> 26.2%	70%	<del>71.0%</del> 67.3%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>8.1%</del> 5.8%	70%	<del>36.2%</del> 31.9%	90%
English learners	<del>28.3%</del> 28.4%	70%	<del>73.8%</del> 69.7%	90%
Caucasian	<del>54.3%</del> 52.8%	70%	<del>87.8%</del> 85.6%	90%
Hispanic	<del>32.8%</del> 30.2%	70%	<del>76.4%</del> 71.3%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>63.5%</del> 66.2%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>91.2%</del> 91.1%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>21.8%</del> 20.4%	70%	<del>67.0%</del> 62.2%	90%
Native American	<del>37.5%</del> 31.1%	70%	<del>79.1%</del> 71.0%	90%

Chart 8- GRADE 6, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups grade 6, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>39.5%</del> 41.5%	70%	<del>74.2%</del> 74.4%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>25.6%</del> 28.1%	70%	<del>64.5%</del> 57.7%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>8.0%</del> 7.3%	70%	<del>33.7%</del> 31.9%	90%
English learners	<del>32.1%</del> 35.0%	70%	<del>71.1%</del> 71.1%	90%
Caucasian	<del>52.7%</del> 54.7%	70%	<del>84.0%</del> 84.1%	90%
Hispanic	<del>32.7%</del> 33.7%	70%	<del>72.5%</del> 71.0%	90%
Asian/Pacific	<del>68.8%</del> 76.6%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>89.9%</del> 93.3%	<del>90%</del> 95%

Subgroups grade 6, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
Islander				
African American	<del>19.8%</del> 21.4%	70%	<del>59.0%</del> 59.2%	90%
Native American	<del>37.3%</del> 34.0%	70%	<del>74.9%</del> 70.1%	90%

Chart 9- GRADE 7, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups grade 7, Reading/ ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>40.7%</del> 36.4%	70%	<del>76.8%</del> 71.6%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>26.4%</del> 23.0%	70%	<del>67.2%</del> 60.9%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>7.7%</del> 4.5%	70%	<del>33.2%</del> 25.2%	90%
English learners	<del>22.7%</del> 24.9%	70%	<del>66.3%</del> 64.7%	90%
Caucasian	<del>53.8%</del> 48.4%	70%	<del>85.7%</del> 81.7%	90%
Hispanic	<del>32.6%</del> 28.2%	70%	<del>72.7%</del> 67.6%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>66.5%</del> 64.9%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>90.4%</del> 88.5%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>21.8%</del> 17.7%	70%	<del>63.6%</del> 55.1%	90%
Native American	<del>37.0%</del> 33.3%	70%	<del>75.6%</del> 74.1%	90%

Chart 10- GRADE 7, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups grade 7, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>34.7%</del> 33.3%	70%	<del>73.4%</del> 69.0%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>20.8%</del> 19.6%	70%	<del>63.5%</del> 57.7%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>7.0%</del> 3.9%	70%	<del>36.2%</del> 26.6%	90%
English learners	<del>21.1%</del> 23.6%	70%	<del>63.2%</del> 63.2%	90%
Caucasian	<del>48.3%</del> 46.4%	70%	<del>84.3%</del> 81.3%	90%
Hispanic	<del>26.7%</del> 24.6%	70%	<del>69.1%</del> 65.2%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>63.1%</del> 66.9%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>90.1%</del> 89.7%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>14.9%</del> 12.9%	70%	<del>57.3%</del> 48.9%	90%
Native American	<del>27.1%</del> 28.8%	70%	<del>78.0%</del> 70.1%	90%

Chart 11- GRADE 8, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups grade 8, Reading/ ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>44.6%</del> 40.1%	70%	<del>77.5%</del> 72.0%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>30.7%</del> 26.2%	70%	<del>68.7%</del> 61.4%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>7.0%</del> 5.5%	70%	<del>31.8%</del> 24.2%	90%
English learners	<del>28.9%</del> 24.7%	70%	<del>67.0%</del> 61.1%	90%
Caucasian	<del>57.1%</del> 52.4%	70%	<del>86.3%</del> 82.1%	90%
Hispanic	<del>37.8%</del> 33.2%	70%	<del>73.2%</del> 67.6%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>68.9%</del> 67.7%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>89.9%</del> 89.1%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>26.1%</del> 20.5%	70%	<del>64.9%</del> 55.6%	90%
Native American	<del>44.3%</del> 28.2%	70%	<del>77.4%</del> 64.1%	90%

Chart 12- GRADE 8, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups grade 8, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>32.4%</del> 34.5%	70%	<del>70.7%</del> 68.5%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>19.7%</del> 21.1%	70%	<del>60.3%</del> 56.9%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>5.1%</del> 4.9%	70%	<del>29.4%</del> 24.9%	90%
English learners	<del>21.6%</del> 23.3%	70%	<del>62.8%</del> 60.2%	90%
Caucasian	<del>43.8%</del> 46.5%	70%	<del>80.5%</del> 79.7%	90%
Hispanic	<del>26.5%</del> 27.7%	70%	<del>66.6%</del> 64.7%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>62.3%</del> 68.4%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>88.3%</del> 90.4%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>15.1%</del> 15.1%	70%	<del>56.2%</del> 50.0%	90%
Native American	<del>31.0%</del> 26.8%	70%	<del>69.6%</del> 56.7%	90%

Chart 13- GRADE HIGH SCHOOL, READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Subgroups high school, Reading/ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
------------------------------------	---	--	---	--

Subgroups high school, Reading/ELA	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better
All students	<del>53.4%</del> 56.2%	70%	<del>73.2%</del> 76.8%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>42.8%</del> 43.1%	70%	<del>65.4%</del> 67.9%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>20.6%</del> 14.3%	70%	<del>41.1%</del> 33.4%	90%
English learners	<del>37.2%</del> 37.4%	70%	<del>58.2%</del> 61.9%	90%
Caucasian	<del>66.5%</del> 69.5%	70%	<del>83.3%</del> 86.0%	90%
Hispanic	<del>48.5%</del> 46.9%	70%	<del>68.4%</del> 69.9%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>71.9%</del> 77.3%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>82.8%</del> 89.4%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>37.6%</del> 36.0%	70%	<del>61.7%</del> 62.8%	90%
Native American	<del>61.1%</del> 44.2%	70%	<del>75.7%</del> 65.7%	90%

Chart 14- GRADE HIGH SCHOOL, MATHEMATICS

Subgroups high school, Mathematics	% of Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 3 or Better	% of Students Scoring at Level 2 or Better – 2017 School Year	Long-term Goal – Students Scoring at Level 2 or better
All students	<del>53.1%</del> 44.6%	70%	<del>75.8%</del> 74.7%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	<del>44.7%</del> 29.9%	70%	<del>70.2%</del> 64.7%	90%
Children with disabilities	<del>25.6%</del> 8.8%	70%	<del>52.6%</del> 35.3%	90%
English learners	<del>49.1%</del> 35.9%	70%	<del>72.4%</del> 68.9%	90%
Caucasian	<del>63.0%</del> 56.8%	70%	<del>83.0%</del> 83.2%	90%
Hispanic	<del>53.0%</del> 38.9%	70%	<del>75.4%</del> 71.8%	90%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<del>78.2%</del> 75.3%	<del>70%</del> 80%	<del>88.4%</del> 92.3%	<del>90%</del> 95%
African American	<del>40.7%</del> 25.1%	70%	<del>67.2%</del> 61.0%	90%
Native American	<del>60.6%</del> 38.0%	70%	<del>76.8%</del> 67.2%	90%

## B. Graduation Rates

The baselines below are 2017 baselines.

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
All students	82.6%	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	87.7%	90%
Children with disabilities	52.1%	90%
English learners	76.0%	90%
Caucasian	84.1%	90%
Hispanic	79.9%	90%

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
Asian/Pacific Islander	93.6%	95%
African American	80.3%	90%
Native American	74.1%	90%

## ALL STUDENTS

### South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	82.6%	90%	7.4 points	3.7 points (86.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 83.7% Y6 Target (2023) = 84.8% Mid-point (2026) = 86.3%

## ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

### South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	83.86%	90%	6.14 points	3.07 points (86.93%)	Y3 Target (2020) =84.88% Y6 Target (2023) = 85.90% Mid-point (2026) = 86.93%

## DISABLED STUDENTS

### South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	53.26%	90%	36.74 points	18.37 points (71.63%)	Y3 Target (2020) =59.38 % Y6 Target (2023) = 65.50% Mid-point (2026) = 71.63%

## LIMITED ENGLISH STUDENTS (EL)

### South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	75.86%	90%	14.14 points	7.07 points (82.93%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 78.22% Y6 Target (2023) = 80.58% Mid-point (2026) = 82.93%

## RACIAL/ETHNIC SUBGROUPS

### ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS

#### South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 95% of students will graduate in four years (subgroup already exceeds 90%, goal set at 95%)

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	92.35%	95%	2.65 points	1.33 points (93.68%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 92.79% Y6 Target (2023) = 93.23%

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
					Mid-point (2026) = 93.68 %

## AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

**South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.**

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	80.98%	90%	9.02 points	4.51 points (85.49%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 82.48% Y6 Target (2023) = 83.98% Mid-point (2026) = 85.49%

## HISPANIC STUDENTS

**South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.**

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	79.08%	90%	10.92 points	5.46 points (84.54%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 80.91% Y6 Target (2023) = 82.74% Mid-point (2026) = 84.54 %

## NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS

**South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.**

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	74.02%	90%	15.98 points	7.99 points (82.01%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.69% Y6 Target (2023) = 79.36% Mid-point (2026) = 82.01 %

## WHITE STUDENTS

**South Carolina Graduation Rate Goal – 90% of students will graduate in four years.**

Target Area	4yr Graduation Rate 2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement
Grad Rate	83.81%	90%	6.19 points	3.10 points (86.91%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 84.84% Y6 Target (2023) = 85.87% Mid-point (2026) = 86.91 %

### C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year) Official baselines will be set in 2017	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
English learners	31% of EL students met their annual progress to proficiency target	2035 70% 2026 50%

### D. Subgroup Goals and Interim Targets

Elementary School- All Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	72.8%	90%	17.2	8.6 (81.4%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 75.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 78.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.4%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	76.1%	90%	13.9	6.95 (83.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 78.4%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 80.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 83.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	41.3%	70%	28.7	14.35 (55.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 46.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 50.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 55.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	47.4%	70%	22.6	11.3 (58.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 51.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 54.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 58.7%

#### Elementary School- White Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	82.9%	90%	7.1	3.55 (86.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 84.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 85.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 86.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.7)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	85.9%	90%	4.1	2.05 (88%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 86.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 87.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 88%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.6)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	54.5%	70%	15.5	7.75 (62.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 57.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 59.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 62.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.5)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	61.1%	70%	8.9	4.45 (65.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 62.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 64.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 65.6%

#### Elementary School- African American Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at	59.9%	90%	30.1	15.05 (75%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 64.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 69.9%



Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5)
Level 2 or higher in ELA					Mid-point (2026) = 75%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.5)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	62.9%	90%	27.1	13.55 (76.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 67.4% Y6 Target (2023) = 71.9% Mid-point (2026) = 76.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (7.6)
AFR.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	24.2%	70%	45.8	22.9 (47.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 31.8% Y6 Target (2023) = 39.5% Mid-point (2026) = 47.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.8)
AFR.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	29%	70%	41	20.5 (49.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 35.8% Y6 Target (2023) = 42.7% Mid-point (2026) = 49.5%

#### Elementary School- Hispanic Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.7)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	67.7%	90%	22.3	11.15 (78.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 71.4% Y6 Target (2023) = 75.1% Mid-point (2026) = 78.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.8)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	73.4%	90%	16.6	8.3 (81.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.2% Y6 Target (2023) = 78.9% Mid-point (2026) = 81.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.2)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	32.6%	70%	37.4	18.7 (51.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 38.8% Y6 Target (2023) = 45.1% Mid-point (2026) = 51.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.9)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	40.6%	70%	29.4	14.7 (55.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 45.5% Y6 Target (2023) = 50.4% Mid-point (2026) = 55.3%

#### Elementary School- Native American Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3)
-------------	------	-----------	----------	-------------	-------------------------

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	72.2%	90%	17.8	8.9 (81.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 75.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 78.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.3)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	76.5%	90%	13.5	6.75 (83.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 78.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 81%
					Mid-point (2026) = 83.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.8)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	41%	70%	29	14.5 (55.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 45.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 50.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 55.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.9)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	46.4%	70%	23.6	11.8 (58.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 50.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 54.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 58.2%

### Elementary School- Asian/ Pacific Islander Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.1)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	89.6%	90%	0.4	0.2 (89.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 89.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 89.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 89.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.4)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	92.6%	95%	2.4	1.2 (93.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 93%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 93.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 93.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.5)
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	67%	70%	3	1.5 (68.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 67.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 68%
					Mid-point (2026) = 68.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (.7)
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	75.8%	80%	4.2	2.1 (77.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 77.2%
					Mid-point (2026) = 77.9%

### Elementary School Students in Poverty

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.4)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	63.9%	90%	26.1	13.05 (77%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 68.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 72.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 77%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.7)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	68.1%	90%	21.9	10.95 (79.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 71.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 75.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 79.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.9)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	28.9%	70%	41.1	20.55 (49.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 35.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 42.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 49.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.8)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	35.3%	70%	34.7	17.35 (52.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 41.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 46.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 52.7%

### Elementary School Students with Limited English Proficiency

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	65.9%	90%	24.1	12.05 (78%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 69.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 73.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 78%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	72.9%	90%	17.1	8.55 (81.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 75.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 78.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.6)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	30.7%	70%	39.3	19.65 (50.4%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 37.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 43.8%
					Mid-point (2026) = 50.4%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.9)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	40.6%	70%	29.4	14.7 (55.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 45.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 50.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 55.3%

### Elementary School- Disabled Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (9.9)
-------------	------	-----------	----------	-------------	---------------------------

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (9.9)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	30.9%	90%	59.1	29.55 (60.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 40.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 50.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 60.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.3)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	40.3%	90%	49.7	24.85 (65.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 48.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 56.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 65.2%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	10.3%	70%	59.7	29.85 (40.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 20.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 30.2%
					Mid-point (2026) = 40.2%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (9)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	15.8%	70%	54.2	27.1 (42.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 24.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 33.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 42.9%

### Middle School- All Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	74.1%	90%	15.9	7.95 (82.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 79.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 82.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	71.6%	90%	18.4	9.2 (80.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 74.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 77.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 80.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	39.6%	70%	30.4	15.2 (54.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 44.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 49.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 54.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	37.4%	70%	32.6	16.3 (53.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 42.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 48.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 53.7%

### Middle School- White Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	83.9%	90%	6.1	3.05 (87%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 84.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 85.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 87%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.2)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	82.6%	90%	7.4	3.7 (86.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 83.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 85.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 86.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	52.2%	70%	17.8	8.9 (61.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 55.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 58.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 61.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.3)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	50.3%	70%	19.7	9.85 (60.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 53.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 56.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 60.2%

### Middle School- African American Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.1)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	59.7%	90%	30.3	15.15 (74.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 64.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 69.8%
					Mid-point (2026) = 74.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.9)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	54.9%	90%	35.1	17.55 (72.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 60.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 66.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 72.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.1)
AFR.AMER.-70% of	21.2%	70%	48.8	24.4 (45.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 29.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.1)
students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA					Y6 Target (2023) = 37.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 45.6%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.7)
AFR.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	18%	70%	52	26 (44%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 26.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 35.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 44%

### Middle School- Hispanic Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.2)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	70.9%	90%	19.1	9.55 (80.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 74.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 77.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 80.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.4)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	69.9%	90%	20.1	10.05 (80%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 73.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 76.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 80%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.4)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	31.6%	70%	38.4	19.2 (50.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 38%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 44.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 50.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.6)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	30.5%	70%	39.5	19.75 (50.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 37.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 43.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 50.3%

### Middle School- Native American Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.8)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	73.4%	90%	16.6	8.3 (81.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 78.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.9)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	72.6%	90%	17.4	8.7 (81.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 75.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 78.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.4)
-------------	------	-----------	----------	-------------	---------------------------

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.4)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	37.4%	70%	32.6	16.3 (53.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 42.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 48.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 53.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.6)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	36.6%	70%	33.4	16.7 (53.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 42.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 47.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 53.3%

### Middle School- Asian/ Pacific Islander Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.7)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	90.6%	95%	4.4	2.2 (92.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 91.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 92.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 92.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.6)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	91.2%	95%	3.8	1.9 (93.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 91.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 92.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 93.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.6)
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	66.6%	70%	3.4	1.7 (68.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 67.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 67.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 68.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.1)
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	69.5%	70%	0.5	0.25 (69.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 69.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 69.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 69.8%

### Middle School Students in Poverty

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.3)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	64.1%	90%	25.9	12.95 (77.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 68.4%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 72.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 77.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.8)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	61%	90%	29	14.5 (75.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 65.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 70.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 75.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (7.4)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	25.7%	70%	44.3	22.15 (47.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 33.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 40.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 47.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (7.7)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	23.7%	70%	46.3	23.15 (46.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 31.4%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 39.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 46.9%

### Middle School Students with Limited English Proficiency

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.7)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	68%	90%	22	11 (79%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 71.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 75.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 79%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.6)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	68.6%	90%	21.4	10.7 (79.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 72.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 75.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 79.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (7.1)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	27.4%	70%	42.6	21.3 (48.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 34.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 41.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 48.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (6.7)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	29.6%	70%	40.4	20.2 (49.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 36.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 43.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 49.8%

### Middle School- Disabled Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10.5)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	27.1%	90%	62.9	31.45 (58.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 37.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 48.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 58.6%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10.4)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	27.9%	90%	62.1	31.05 (59%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 38.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 48.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 59%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10.8)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at	5.1%	70%	64.9	32.45 (37.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 15.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 26.7%



Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10.8)
Level 3 or higher in ELA					Mid-point (2026) = 37.6%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (10.8)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	5.4%	70%	64.6	32.3 (37.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 16.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 26.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 37.7%

### High School- All Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.9)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	78.9%	90%	11.1	5.55 (84.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 80.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 82.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 84.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.9)
90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	87.5%	90%	2.5	1.25 (88.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 87.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 88.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 88.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.9)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	60.2%	70%	9.8	4.9 (65.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 61.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 63.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 65.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.9)
70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	67.7%	70%	2.3	1.15 (68.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 68.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 68.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 68.9%

### High School- White Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.9)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	87.9%	90%	2.1	1.05 (89%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 88.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 88.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 89%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.5)
WHITE-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	92.2%	95%	2.8	1.4 (93.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 92.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 93.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 93.6%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (-0.5)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	72.8%	70%	-2.8	-1.4 (71.4%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 72.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 71.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 71.4%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (-1.2)
WHITE-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	77.2%	70%	-7.2	-3.6 (73.6%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 74.8%
					Mid-point (2026) = 73.6%

### High School Students- African American

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.1)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	65.3%	90%	24.7	12.35 (77.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 69.4%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 73.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 77.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.7)
AFR.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	79.9%	90%	10.1	5.05 (85%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 81.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 83.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 85%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.9)
AFR.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	40.6%	70%	29.4	14.7 (55.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 45.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 50.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 55.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3)
AFR.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	52.3%	70%	17.7	8.85 (61.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 55.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 58.2%
					Mid-point (2026) = 61.2%

### High School Students- Hispanic

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	73.7%	90%	16.3	8.15 (81.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 76.4%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 79.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 81.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.7)
HISPANIC-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	85.9%	90%	4.1	2.05 (88%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 86.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 87.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 88%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.7)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	53.6%	70%	16.4	8.2 (61.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 56.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 59.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 61.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.7)
HISPANIC-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	65.9%	70%	4.1	2.05 (68%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 66.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 67.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 68%

### High School- Native American Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.6)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	80.6%	90%	9.4	4.7 (85.3%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 82.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 83.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 85.3%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.4)
NAT.AMER.-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	87.4%	90%	2.6	1.3 (88.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 87.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 88.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 88.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.2)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	63%	70%	7	3.5 (66.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 64.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 65.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 66.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.5)
NAT.AMER.-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	67.3%	70%	2.7	1.35 (68.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 67.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 68.2%
					Mid-point (2026) = 68.7%

### High School- Asian/ Pacific Islanders

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.8)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	90.4%	95%	4.6	2.3 (92.7%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 91.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 91.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 92.7%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (0.4)
ASIAN/PI-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	97.7%	100%	2.3	1.15 (98.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 98.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 98.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 98.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement ( )
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in	79.9%	70%		0 (79.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 79.9%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 79.9%
					Mid-point (2026) = 79.9%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement ( )
ELA					

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement ( )
ASIAN/PI-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	89.1%	70%		0 (89.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 89.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 89.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 89.1%

### High School Students in Poverty

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.1)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	71.6%	90%	18.4	9.2 (80.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 74.7%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 77.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 80.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.1)
POVERTY-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	83.5%	90%	6.5	3.25 (86.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 84.6%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 85.7%
					Mid-point (2026) = 86.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (3.6)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	48.4%	70%	21.6	10.8 (59.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 52%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 55.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 59.2%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2)
POVERTY-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	58.3%	70%	11.7	5.85 (64.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 60.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 62.2%
					Mid-point (2026) = 64.2%

### High School Students with Limited English Proficiency

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	60.1%	90%	29.9	14.95 (75.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 65.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 70.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 75.1%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (1.6)
LEP-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	80.7%	90%	9.3	4.65 (85.4%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 82.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 83.8%
					Mid-point (2026) = 85.4%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (5.9)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	34.9%	70%	35.1	17.55 (52.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 40.8%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 46.6%
					Mid-point (2026) = 52.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (2.4)
LEP-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	55.8%	70%	14.2	7.1 (62.9%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 58.2%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 60.5%
					Mid-point (2026) = 62.9%

### High School- Disabled Students

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.4)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in ELA	39.6%	90%	50.4	25.2 (64.8%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 48%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 56.4%
					Mid-point (2026) = 64.8%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (4.9)
DISABLED-90% of students will score at Level 2 or higher in Math	60.4%	90%	29.6	14.8 (75.2%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 65.3%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 70.3%
					Mid-point (2026) = 75.2%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (8.5)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in ELA	19%	70%	51	25.5 (44.5%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 27.5%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 36%
					Mid-point (2026) = 44.5%

Target Area	2017	2035 Goal	Distance	2026 Target	Interim Improvement (7)
DISABLED-70% of students will score at Level 3 or higher in Math	28.1%	70%	41.9	20.95 (49.1%)	Y3 Target (2020) = 35.1%
					Y6 Target (2023) = 42.1%
					Mid-point (2026) = 49.1%

## Appendix E: Disproportionality within Schools Served under Title I, Part A

Current data for the 2016–17 school year indicate some disproportionality exists within Title I schools. Of particular concern is the percentage of students enrolled in Title I schools – whether low-income or non-low-income – taught by out-of-field teachers in ELA, Math, or Science. The SCDE continues to analyze and check the validity of these data, and anticipates working with districts to improve the quality of the data used to measure percentage of students taught by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers at the student level.

Rate and Difference in Rate at Which Low-Income and Minority Students Enrolled in Schools Served under Title I, Part A Are Taught by Ineffective, Out-of-Field, and Inexperienced Teachers, 2016–17

Student Groups	Percentage of students taught by an ineffective teacher in ELA, Math, or Science <sup>a</sup>	Difference between rates	Percentage of students taught by an out-of-field teacher in ELA, Math, or Science <sup>a</sup>	Difference between rates	Percentage of students taught by an inexperienced teacher in ELA, Math, or Science <sup>a</sup>	Difference between rates
Low-income students enrolled in Title I schools	0.4%	0 percentage points	65.1%	1.1 percentage points	11.9%	0.2 percentage points
Non-low-income students enrolled in Title I schools	0.4%		66.2%		11.7%	
Minority students enrolled in Title I schools	0.6%	0.1 percentage points	61.8%	0.5 percentage points	13.0%	0.3 percentage points
Non-minority students enrolled in Title I schools	0.5%		62.3%		12.7%	

Note. <sup>a</sup>Student-level data examined are restricted to ELA, Math, and Science to maintain accuracy. In the future, the SCDE intends to include additional subject areas.

## Appendix F: Special School Packet

### EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: Academic Standards and Assessment

Date: June 12, 2017

**ACTION ITEM:** Recommendations for Ratings of Special Schools

#### **PURPOSE/AUTHORITY**

Sections 59-18-325 and Section 59-18-900(C) of the Education Accountability Act, as amended, require the EOC to establish criteria for the academic performance ratings of schools, including the following special schools that provide educational services to students: the Department of Corrections, Palmetto Unified School District; Department of Juvenile Justice; Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School; South Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind; Governor's School for Science and Mathematics; and Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities. The John de la Howe School was not included since the school is no longer accredited, and students residing at John de la Howe School currently receive educational services from the McCormick County School District.

#### **CRITICAL FACTS**

Attached are the recommendations for the metrics and weights to evaluate the special schools of the state beginning in school year 2017-18. These recommendations follow, to the extent possible, the January 2017 EOC report *Single Accountability System* with the following exceptions: (1) The scale used to assign the overall rating is a 100-point scale to be consistent with H.3969 as approved by the House and currently under debate by the Senate. If the State moves to a 120-point scale, then the points would be increased accordingly; (2) each special school will receive only one rating (Excellent, Good, Average, etc.) for the overall performance and not individual ratings for each indicator; and (3) the ESSA accountability requirement for English language learners is not currently weighted in the ratings of these special schools since in the last five years, none of the schools has served twenty or more English language learners. Due to unique mission of each special school, the indicators used are specific to the school's mission, unique student population and therefore cannot be compared to other schools or districts in the state.

#### **TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS**

March 1, 2017	EOC staff contacted presidents/superintendents/directors of the special schools to schedule meetings to begin work on devising accountability ratings and metrics.
March-April, 2017	EOC staff met with special schools individually to devise rating criteria March 15, 2017 ASA Subcommittee met, amended the criteria and recommends approval of the attached criteria.

#### **ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC**

There was no fiscal impact to the EOC.

Fund/Source:

#### **ACTION REQUEST**

☒ For approval

☐ For information

#### **ACTION TAKEN**

☐ Approved  
☐ Not Approved

☐ Amended  
☐ Action deferred (explain)

## **S.C. GOVERNOR’S SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES (SCGSAH)**

### **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

The S.C. Governor’s School for the Arts and Humanities (SCGSAH) is a residential high school in Greenville, SC for artistically gifted young people in grades 10-12. Students are admitted in the following programs offered at the school: Drama, Creative Writing, Visual Arts, Dance, and Music.

Students enrolled in the school as of the forty-fifth day of instruction and continuing through spring testing period are to be included in the following calculations.

### **Criteria for the Rating:**

#### **Achievement**

- Student participation in auditions
- Student acceptance in programs following successful auditions
- AP passage rate (exams scored three and above)

#### **Graduation Rate**

- On-time graduation rate

#### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

#### **Prepared for Success**

- Composite results on The ACT for graduating class
- Percentage of students who receive Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys certificates

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

### **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the seven criterion described herein will determine the school’s overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:



**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: S.C. Governor’s School for the Arts and Humanities**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>		
Audition Participation	10	The score is the percentage of students who participated in an audition before the end of their senior year, rounded to one decimal place (e.g., 94.7). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
Audition Recognition	10	The score is the percentage of students who participated in an audition before the end of their senior year and were accepted by their program, rounded to one decimal place (e.g., 94.3). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
AP	20	The score is: 1) the percentage of students with a score of 3 or higher, expressed as a decimal (e.g., .772), 2) multiplied by 20, and 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>ON-TIME GRADUATION RATE</b>		
Graduation Rate	20	The score is: 1) the percentage of students in the graduation cohort defined by 9GR=17 who graduated, expressed as a decimal (e.g., .925), 2) multiplied by 20, and 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (EL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	10	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined

PREPARED FOR SUCCESS		
ACT	15	The score is obtained by computing the mean ACT Composite score to one decimal place (e.g., 29.7). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
WorkKeys	15	The score is: 1) the percentage of students who receive a Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys Certificate, rounded to one decimal place (e.g., .952), 2) multiplied by 15, and 3) rounded to the nearest whole number

**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: S.C. Governor's School  
for the Arts and Humanities**

Achievement				Positive Learning Environment		Prepared for Success*	
Auditions (Use for both Participation & Recognition)		AP		Results of Student Survey		ACT	
Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores
1	<=82.4	1	<=63	1	To Be Determined	1	<=20.4
2	82.5-84.4	2	64-65	2		2	20.5-21.4
3	84.5-86.4	3	66-67	3		3	21.5-22.4
4	86.5-88.4	4	68-69	4		4	22.5-23.4
5	88.5-90.4	5	70-71	5		5	23.5-24.4
6	90.5-92.4	6	71-72	6		6	24.5-25.4
7	92.5-94.4	7	73-74	7		7	25.5-26.4
8	94.5-96.4	8	75-76	8		8	26.5-27.4
9	96.5-98.4	9	77-78	9		9	27.5-28.4
10	98.5-100	10	79-80	10		10	28.5-29.4
		11	81-82			11	29.5-30.4
		12	83-84			12	30.5-31.4
		13	85-86			13	31.5-32.4
		14	87-88			14	32.5-33.4
		15	89-90			15	>=33.5
		16	91-92				
		17	93-94				
		18	95-96				
		19	97-98				
		20	99-100				

NOTE: The on-time graduation rate and WorkKeys score computations result in points, which do not require further conversion.

**Table 3**  
**Sample Rating Calculation: S.C. Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities**

Criteria	Observed Values	Score/Computation	Score converted to Points
<b>Achievement</b>			
Audition Participation	95.5	95.5	8
Audition Recognition	90.4	90.4	5
AP Pass Rate	77.2	.772*20=15.4	15
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	98.8	.988*20=19.8	20
<b>Positive Learning Environment</b>			5*
<b>Prepared for Success</b>			
ACT	23.7	23.7	5
WorkKeys	95.5	.955*15=14.33	14
<b>Total</b>			<b>72*</b>

\* assumes the midpoint of the scores for positive learning environment.

**Table 4**  
**Conversion of Points to Ratings: ALL Special Schools**

Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
39 or lower	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 or higher

[DRAFT REPORT CARD](#) (sample landing page) [ESPAÑOL](#) | [CONTACT](#) | [LOGIN](#)  

Search



## 15 University St. | Greenville, SC | Grades 9-12



864-282-3777



[www.scgsah.org](http://www.scgsah.org)



SCGSAH

- The SC Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities serves artistically talented high school students in grades 10-12.
- Read the Mission and Values of the SC Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities, a public residential high school.

## Excellent

### WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT SCHOOL

[VIEW SCHOOL WEBSITE](#)

This component is compilation of Audition, Participation, Audition Recognition, and the percent of students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses scoring a 3 or higher.

[VIEW MORE INFO](#)

This component is the percentage of students at the school who graduate on-time.

[VIEW MORE INFO](#)[DOWNLOAD AS PDF](#)

This component measures the progress students are making on The ACT and WorkKeys, a career-readiness assessment.

VIEW ACHIEVEMENT  
RESULTS ON ACT

**VIEW ACHIEVEMENT  
RESULTS ON WorkKeys**



A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

[VIEW MORE INFO](#)

Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.

SHARE

## **S.C. GOVERNOR’S SCHOOL FOR SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (SCGSSM)**

### **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

The S.C. Governor’s School for Science and Mathematics (SCGSSM) is a residential high school in Hartsville, SC for young people in grades 10-12 who are academically gifted in STEM.

Students enrolled in the school as of the forty-fifth day of instruction and continuing through spring testing period are to be included in the following calculations.

### **Criteria for the Rating:**

#### **Achievement**

- Performance of graduating seniors on ACT Subtests: English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science (with Mathematics and Science weighted higher for graduating class)

#### **Graduation Rate**

- On-time graduation rate

#### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

#### **Prepared for Success**

- Average first semester freshman GPA of students in college
- Percentage of students who receive Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys certificates

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

### **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the five criterion described herein will determine the school’s overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: S.C. Governor's School for Science and Mathematics**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>		
ACT Sub-test performance	40	For each subtest, the score is the subtest mean score rounded to the tenths place (e.g., 29.3). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points for each subtest.</i>
<b>ON-TIME GRADUATION RATE</b>		
Graduation Rate	20	The score is: 1) the percentage of students in the graduation cohort defined by 9GR=17 who graduated, expressed as a decimal (e.g., .925), 2) multiplied by 20, and 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	10	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined
<b>PREPARED FOR SUCCESS</b>		
Freshman GPA	20	The score is the mean first semester freshman GPA as obtained from fall semester transcript, rounded to hundredths place (e.g., 3.17). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</i>
WorkKeys	10	The score is: 4) the percentage of students who receive a Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys Certificate, rounded to one decimal place (e.g., .952), 5) multiplied by 10, and 6) rounded to the nearest whole number

**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: S.C. Governor's**  
**School for Science and Mathematics**

Achievement			Positive Learning Environment		Prepared for Success	
					Freshman GPA	
Points English, Reading	ACT Scores	Points Math, Science	Points	Scores	Points	Scores
0.3	<=20.4	1	1	To be determined	1	<=2.89
0.7	20.5-21.4	2	2		2	2.90-2.95
1	21.5-22.4	3	3		3	2.95-2.99
1.3	22.5-23.4	4	4		4	3.00-3.04
1.7	23.5-24.4	5	5		5	3.05-3.09
2	24.5-25.4	6	6		6	3.10-3.14
2.3	25.5-26.4	7	7		7	3.15-3.19
2.7	26.5-27.4	8	8		8	3.20-3.24
3	27.5-28.4	9	9		9	3.25-3.29
3.3	28.5-29.4	10	10		10	3.30-3.34
3.7	29.5-30.4	11			11	3.35-3.39
4	30.5-31.4	12			12	3.40-3.44
4.3	31.5-32.4	13			13	3.45-3.49
4.7	32.5-33.4	14			14	3.50-3.54
5	>=33.5	15			15	3.55-3.59
					16	3.60-3.64
					17	3.65-3.69
					18	3.70-3.74
					19	3.75-3.79
					20	>=3.80

NOTE: The on-time graduation rate and WorkKeys score computations result in points, which do not require further conversion.

**Table 3**  
**Sample Rating Calculation: S.C. Governor's School for Science and Mathematics**

Criteria	Observed Values	Score/Computation	Score converted to Points
<b>Achievement</b>			
<b>Average ACT Subtest Score</b>			
English Reading	28.9	28.9	3.3
Mathematics	29.8	29.8	3.7
Science	29.5	29.5	11
	29.4	29.4	10
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	94	.94*20=18.9	19
<b>Positive Learning Environment</b>			5*
<b>Prepared for Success</b>			
Freshman GPA	3.51	3.51	14
WorkKeys	75.2	.752*10=7.52	8
<b>Total</b>			<b>74*</b>

\* assumes the midpoint of the scores for positive learning environment.

**Table 4**  
**Conversion of Points to Ratings: ALL Special Schools**


Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
39 or lower	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 or higher



The following template is designed to provide a visual representation of what a website landing page might look like using these data elements. All data used are for PLACEMENT PURPOSES ONLY.

DRAFT REPORT CARD (sample landing page)
ESPAÑOL | CONTACT | LOGIN

Home OVERVIEW
Student Learning
School Environment
Prepared for Success
Student Opportunities
Finances
Search



**South Carolina Governor's School for Science & Mathematics**

# Governor's School for Science and Mathematics

401 Railroad Ave. | Hartsville, SC | Grades 9-12

843-383-3901 | www.scgssm.org | SCGSSM

- The SC Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities serves academically gifted high school students in grades 10-12.
- Read the [Mission and Values](#) of the SC Governor's School for Science and Mathematics, a public residential high school.

School Performance Rating

**Excellent**

WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT SCHOOL

VIEW SCHOOL WEBSITE

## Student Achievement

This component is compilation of ACT Subtest Performance in English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science.

VIEW MORE INFO

## Prepared for Success

This component measures the average first semester freshman GPA and results on WorkKeys, a career-readiness assessment.

VIEW FRESHMAN GPA RESULTS

VIEW ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS ON WorkKeys

## Graduation Rate

This component is the percentage of students at the school who graduate on-time.

VIEW MORE INFO

DOWNLOAD AS PDF

## Positive Learning Environment

A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

VIEW MORE INFO

*Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.*

SHARE

204

## **SC SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND BLIND (SCSDB)**

### **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

The SC School for the Deaf and the Blind is the state's specialized school for students who are deaf or blind, ages 3-21. The main campus is located in Spartanburg, but the school serves students statewide through its campus and outreach programs.

Elementary, middle or high school students who are enrolled in the school as of the 45<sup>th</sup> day of instruction and are present in the school on the first day of testing will be included in assessment measures.

### **Criteria for the Rating:**

#### **Achievement**

- Average student achievement on SC READY and SC PASS.
- Percent of students meeting IEP goals

#### **Student Progress**

- Average student progress on SC READY in ELA and Mathematics
- Average student progress on Brigance Inventory

#### **Graduation Rate**

- Percent of students who are employed, in post-secondary education, or in the military, sheltered workshop, etc. one year after completing.

#### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

#### **Prepared for Success**

- Percentage of students in grades 9-12 who participate in work-based learning.

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

### **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the seven criterion described herein will determine the school's overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: SC School for the Deaf and Blind**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>		
SC READY and SC PASS performance	20	<p>The score is obtained by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) find the sum of points for ELA and Math where for each student points are assigned as: 0=Does not meet, 1=Approaches, 2=Meets, 3=Exceeds</li> <li>2) find total possible points for ELA and Math (3 points for each student with an ELA score and 3 points for each student with a Math score.</li> <li>3) find the sum of points for Science and Social Studies where for each student points are assigned as: 0=Not Met 1, 1=Not Met 2, 2=Met, 3=Exemplary 4, and 4=Exemplary 5.</li> <li>4) find total possible points for Science and Social Studies (4 points for each student with a Science score and 4 points for each student with a Social Studies score.</li> <li>5) find the sum of points for all subjects by adding the sums of points in (1) and (3)</li> <li>6) find the total possible points for all subjects by adding the possible points in (2) and (4).</li> <li>7) divide the sum of points by the total possible points to get a percentage expressed as a decimal,</li> <li>8) multiply the value in (7) by 20, and</li> <li>9) round the value in (8) to tenths place.</li> </ol> <p><i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</i></p>
IEP Goals	10	<p>The score is the average of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the percent of students who met their IEP goal in ELA, and</li> <li>2) the percentage of students who met their IEP goal in Math, then</li> <li>3) round the average to one decimal place, and</li> <li>4) express as a decimal (e.g., .934), then</li> <li>5) multiplied by 10, and</li> <li>6) rounded to the nearest whole number.</li> </ol>
<b>STUDENT PROGRESS</b>		
SC READY Progress	10	<p>The score is the average of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the percent of students who increased in level minus the percent of students who decreased in level in ELA, and</li> <li>2) the percent of students who increased in level minus the percent of students who decreased in level in Math, then</li> <li>3) round the average to tenths place (e.g., 4.1).</li> </ol> <p><i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i></p>
Brigance Inventory	20	<p>The score is the average of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the percent of students who improved in ELA, and</li> </ol>

		2) the percent of students who improved in Math, then 3) round the average to the nearest whole number. <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</i>
<b>GRADUATION RATE</b>		
Graduation Rate	20	The score is: 1) the percent of students placed 1-year post completion into: post-secondary education, employment, the military, a sheltered workshop, etc.), 2) multiplied by 20, then 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	10	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined
<b>PREPARED FOR SUCCESS</b>		
Work-Based Learning	10	The score is: 1) the percent of eligible students in grades 9-12 who participate in work-based learning, 2) multiplied by 10, then 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: SC School for the Deaf and Blind**


Achievement		Student Progress					
SC Ready & PASS		SC Ready		Brigance			
Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores
1	0.0-1.9	1	<=0.4	1	<=81	11	91
2	2.0-3.9	2	0.5-0.9	2	82	12	92
3	4.0-5.9	3	1.0-1.4	3	83	13	93
4	6.0-7.9	4	1.5-1.9	4	84	14	94
5	8.0-9.9	5	2.0-2.4	5	85	15	95
6	10.0-11.9	6	2.5-2.9	6	86	16	96
7	12.0-13.9	7	3.0-3.4	7	87	17	97
8	14.0-15.9	8	3.5-3.9	8	88	18	98
9	16.0-17.9	9	4.0-4.4	9	89	19	99
10	>=18.0	10	>=4.5	10	90	20	100

NOTE: IEP Goals, Graduation Rate, and Work-based learning data result in numbers which do not require further conversion.

The following template is designed to provide a visual representation of what a website landing page might look like using these data elements. All data used are for PLACEMENT PURPOSES ONLY.

DRAFT REPORT CARD (sample landing page)
ESPAÑOL | CONTACT | LOGIN

Home OVERVIEW
Student Learning
School Environment
Prepared for Success
Student Opportunities
Finances
Search



# SC School for the Deaf and Blind

355 Cedar Springs Rd. | Spartanburg, SC |

864-585-7711 | www.scsdb.org

- The SC School for the Deaf and the Blind is the state's specialized school for students who are deaf or blind, ages 3-21. The main campus is located in Spartanburg, but the school serves students statewide through its campus and outreach programs.

## Performance Rating

### Good

WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT SCHOOL

VIEW SCHOOL WEBSITE

### Student Achievement

This component shows the average student performance in English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies as well as IEP goals.

VIEW MORE DATA

### Student Progress

This component represents the progress of students on SC READY and the Brigrance Inventory.

VIEW MORE DATA

### Graduation Rate

This component is the percentage of students who are successful 1-yr. post completion.

VIEW MORE DATA

DOWNLOAD AS PDF

### Prepared for Success

This component measures the percent of students in grades 9-12 who participate in work-based learning opportunities.

VIEW MORE DATA

### School Environment

A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

VIEW MORE DATA

*Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.*

SHARE

## **SC DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE (SCDJJ)**

### **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

The South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice (SCDJJ) is responsible for providing custodial care and rehabilitation for the state's children who are incarcerated, on probation or parole, or in community placement for a criminal or status offense. The school consists of one long-term facility and three regional evaluation centers, one detention center and ten satellite programs. These school sites provide education for approximately 700 students in grades 6-12.

Eligible students who have participated in the educational program at SCDJJ and have had relevant information on the following measures collected from them are to be included.

### **Criteria for the Rating:**

#### **Student Achievement**

- Achievement indicator based on high school credits earned and middle school courses passed.

#### **Student Progress**

- Average gains in Reading and Math on formative assessments

#### **GED Success Rate**

- Percent of students who pass the GED

#### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

#### **Prepared for Success**

- Percentage of students who receive Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys certificates

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

### **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the five criterion described herein will determine the school's overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: SC Department of Juvenile Justice (SCDJJ)**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>		
Student Achievement	30	The score is the average of : 1) average High School Credits Earned, and 2) average Middle School Courses Passed, 3) rounded to tenths place (e.g., 3.2) <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
<b>STUDENT PROGRESS</b>		
Student Progress	30	Using each student's formative assessment information, the score is the average of: 1) the percentage of students with positive gains in Reading, and 2) the percentage of students with positive gains in Mathematics, 3) rounded to tenths place (e.g., 28.7) <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
<b>GED SUCCESS RATE</b>		
GED Success Rate	20	The score is the percent of students who pass the GED among students who: 4) are 16 years or older, and 5) have scored "likely to pass" on the GED Ready exam, 6) multiplied by 20, and 7) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	10	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined
<b>PREPARED FOR SUCCESS</b>		
WorkKeys	10	The score is: 1) the percentage of students who receive a Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys Certificate, 2) rounded to the nearest whole number. <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>



**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: SC Department of**  
**Juvenile Justice (SCDJJ)**

Achievement		Progress		Positive Learning Environment		Prepared for Success	
Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores
1	0.0-0.24	1	0.0-4.4	1	To be determined	1	<=29
2	0.25-0.44	2	4.5-8.4	2		2	30-34
3	0.45-0.64	3	8.5-11.4	3		3	35-39
4	0.65-0.84	4	11.5-14.4	4		4	40-44
5	0.85-1.04	5	14.5-18.4	5		5	45-49
6	1.05-1.24	6	18.5-21.4	6		6	50-54
7	1.25-1.44	7	21.5-24.4	7		7	55-59
8	1.45-1.64	8	24.5-28.4	8		8	60-64
9	1.65-1.84	9	28.5-31.4	9		9	65-69
10	1.85-2.04	10	31.5-34.4	10		10	>=70
11	2.05-2.24	11	34.5-37.4				
12	2.25-2.44	12	37.5-41.4				
13	2.45-2.64	13	41.5-44.4				
14	2.65-2.84	14	44.5-47.4				
15	2.85-3.04	15	47.5-51.4				
16	3.05-3.24	16	51.5-54.4				
17	3.25-3.44	17	54.5-57.4				
18	3.45-3.64	18	57.5-61.4				
19	3.65-3.84	19	61.5-64.4				
20	3.85-4.04	20	64.5-67.4				
21	4.05-4.24	21	67.5-70.4				
22	4.25-4.44	22	70.5-74.4				
23	4.45-4.64	23	74.5-77.4				
24	4.65-4.84	24	77.5-80.4				
25	4.85-5.04	25	80.5-84.4				
26	5.05-5.24	26	84.5-87.4				
27	5.25-5.44	27	87.5-90.4				
28	5.45-5.64	28	90.5-94.4				
29	5.65-5.84	29	94.5-97.4				
30	5.85-6.00	30	97.5-100.0				

NOTE: The GED Success Rate score computations result in points, which do not require further conversion.

**Table 3**  
**Sample Rating Calculation:**  
**SC Department of Juvenile Justice (SCDJJ)**

Criteria	Observed Values	Score / Computation	Points
<b>Achievement</b>	Average H.S. Credit: 3.2 Average M.S. Courses: 4.1	3.65	19
<b>Progress</b>	Mathematics - 68 Reading - 75	71.5	22
<b>GED Success Rate</b>	78	$.78 \times 20 = 15.6$	16
<b>Positive Learning Environment</b>			5*
<b>Prepared for Success</b>			
<b>WorkKeys</b>	37.5	37.5	3
<b>Total</b>			<b>65</b>

\* assumes the midpoint of the scores for positive learning environment.

**Table 4**  
**Conversion of Points to Ratings: ALL Special Schools**

Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
39 or lower	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 or higher

The following template is designed to provide a visual representation of what a website landing page might look like using these data elements. All data used are for PLACEMENT PURPOSES ONLY.

DRAFT REPORT CARD (sample landing page)
ESPAÑOL | CONTACT | LOGIN

Home OVERVIEW

Student Learning

School Environment

Prepared for Success

Student Opportunities

Finances

Search



**South Carolina**  
DEPARTMENT OF  
JUVENILE JUSTICE

# SC Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

4900 Broad River Rd. | Columbia, SC | Grades 6-12

 803-896-9749
 www.state.sc.us/djj

- SC DJJ provides education for the state's children who are incarcerated, on probation or parole, or in community placement for a criminal or status offense. Students in grades 6-12 are served.

Performance Rating

Good

WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT SCHOOL

VIEW SCHOOL WEBSITE



## Student Achievement

This component measures high school credits earned and middle school courses passed.

VIEW MORE DATA



## Student Progress

This component looks at student progress in Reading and Math .

VIEW MORE DATA



## GED Success Rate

This component is the percentage of students who pass the GED.

VIEW MORE DATA

DOWNLOAD AS PDF



## Prepared for Success

This component measures the progress students are making on WorkKeys, a career-readiness assessment.

VIEW MORE DATA



## School Environment

A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

VIEW MORE DATA

*Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.*

SHARE

214

## **PALMETTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

### ***The SC Department of Corrections***

#### **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

The Palmetto Unified School District serves inmates within the South Carolina Department of Corrections, ages 17-21, in ten high schools around the state. The district also has 12 adult education centers that serve incarcerated adult learners, who are over the age of 21. All Palmetto Unified programs are to be reported as one school.

Achievement and performance data for students who are between the ages of 17 and 21 and who have been continuously served for 100 or more days are to be included in the criteria for the rating.

#### **Criteria for the Rating:**

##### **Achievement / Student Progress**

- Achievement gains on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

##### **GED Success Rate**

- Percent of students who pass the GED

##### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

##### **Prepared for Success**

- Percentage of students who obtain a vocational certification among students who have completed a CATE program
- Percentage of students who receive Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys certificates

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

#### **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the five criterion described herein will determine the school's overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: Palmetto Unified School District**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT / STUDENT PROGRESS</b>		
TABE Progress	30	<p>The score is the mean gain on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the gain is obtained by subtracting the mean pre-test GE from their post-test GE, where</li> <li>2) mean GEs are expressed to 2 decimal places (e.g., 1.73).</li> </ol> <p>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</p>
<b>GED SUCCESS RATE</b>		
GED Success Rate	20	<p>The score is the percent of students who pass the GED or obtain a high school diploma among students who were enrolled in a GED program.</p> <p>The percent is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) expressed as a decimal (e.g., .782),</li> <li>2) multiplied by 20, then</li> <li>3) rounded to the nearest whole number</li> </ol>
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	5	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined.
<b>PREPARED FOR SUCCESS</b>		
CATE	25	<p>The score is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the percent of students who obtain a vocational certificate among students who have completed a CATE program,</li> <li>2) rounded to the nearest whole number.</li> </ol> <p>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</p>
WorkKeys	20	<p>The score is a modified percent of students who receive a Workkeys Certificate where in calculating the percentage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) students are awarded .5 points for attaining a Bronze WorkKeys Certificate, or</li> <li>4) 1 point for attaining a Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys Certificate,</li> <li>5) among students who did not previously receive a WorkKeys certificate, which is then</li> <li>6) rounded to the nearest whole number.</li> </ol> <p>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points.</p>

**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: Palmetto Unified School District**

Achievement/ Progress: TABE Progress		Positive Learning Environment		Prepared for Success: WorkKeys		Prepared for Success: CATE	
Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores	Points	Scores
1	<=0.55	1	To be determined	1	<=42	1	<=52
2	0.56-0.60	2		2	43-45	2	53-54
3	0.61-0.65	3		3	46-48	3	55-56
4	0.66-0.70	4		4	49-51	4	57-58
5	0.71-0.75	5		5	52-54	5	59-60
6	0.76-0.80			6	55-57	6	61-62
7	0.81-0.85			7	58-60	7	63-64
8	0.86-0.90			8	61-63	8	65-66
9	0.91-0.95			9	64-66	9	67-68
10	0.96-1.00			10	67-69	10	69-70
11	1.01-1.05			11	70-72	11	71-72
12	1.06-1.10			12	73-75	12	73-74
13	1.11-1.15			13	76-78	13	75-76
14	1.16-1.20			14	79-81	14	77-78
15	1.21-1.25			15	82-84	15	79-80
16	1.26-1.30			16	85-87	16	81-82
17	1.31-1.35			17	88-91	17	83-84
18	1.36-1.40			18	91-93	18	85-86
19	1.41-1.45			19	94-96	19	87-88
20	1.46-1.50			20	97-100	20	89-90
21	1.51-1.55					21	91-92
22	1.56-1.60					22	93-94
23	1.61-1.65					23	95-96
24	1.66-1.70					24	97-98
25	1.71-1.75					25	99-100
26	1.76-1.80						
27	1.81-1.85						
28	1.86-1.90						
29	1.91-1.95						
30	>=1.96						

NOTE: The GED Success Rate score computations result in points, which do not require further conversion.

**Table 3**  
**Sample Rating Calculation: Palmetto Unified School District**

Criteria	Observed Values	Score / Computation	Points
<b>Achievement / Progress</b>			
TABE	1.5	1.5	20
<b>GED Success Rate</b>	81	$.81 \times 20 = 16.2$	16
<b>Positive Learning Environment</b>			5*
<b>Prepared for Success</b>			
CATE	72	72	11
WorkKeys	74	74	12
<b>Total</b>			<b>64</b>

\* assumes the midpoint of the scores for positive learning environment.


**Table 4**  
**Conversion of Points to Ratings: ALL Special Schools**

Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
39 or lower	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 or higher

The following template is designed to provide a visual representation of what a website landing page might look like using these data elements. All data used are for PLACEMENT PURPOSES ONLY.

DRAFT REPORT CARD (sample landing page)
ESPANOL | CONTACT | LOGIN

Home OVERVIEW
Student Learning
School Environment
Prepared for Success
Student Opportunities
Finances
Search



## Palmetto Unified School District

1735 Haviland Cir. | Columbia, SC | Grades PK-5

803-896-1583 | www.doc.sc.gov/educationpusd.jsp#history

- Palmetto Unified School District (PUSD) serves inmates within the SC Dept. of Corrections ages 17-21 in ten high schools. There are also 17 adult education centers that serve adult learners, who are over the age of 21.
- PUSD's mission is to maximize the academic, vocational and life skills of student inmates for their successful return to society.

### Performance Rating

**Good**

WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT DISTRICT

VIEW DISTRICT WEBSITE

### Achievement / Progress

This component represents the progress of students on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

VIEW MORE DATA

### GED Success Rate

This component is the percentage of students who pass the GED.

VIEW MORE DATA

DOWNLOAD AS PDF

### Prepared for Success

This component measures the progress students are making on WorkKeys, a career-readiness assessment, as well as the percentage of students who obtain a vocational certificate after completion of a CATE Program.

VIEW MORE DATA

### School Environment

A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

VIEW MORE DATA

*Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.*

SHARE



# **WIL LOU GRAY OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL**

## **Students to Be Included in the Rating**

Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School serves “at-risk” young people, ages 16-19 years old, who are on a path toward failing at their current school; dropping out of school; or engaging in an unhealthy, negative lifestyle because of bad choices.

All students who are enrolled in the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School for any of the three-month program periods each fiscal year are to be included.

## **Criteria for the Rating:**

### **Achievement**

- Average percent passage on each of the five GED sections

### **Student Progress**

- Achievement gains on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

### **GED Success Rate**

- Percent of students who pass the GED

### **Positive Learning Environment**

- Results of student survey on learning environment

### **Prepared for Success**

- Percentage of students who score at or above the minimum score of 31 on the ASVAB
- Percentage of students who receive Silver, Gold, or Platinum WorkKeys certificates

*\*Note: While required by Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), the performance of English language learners is not currently factored into the rating criteria for special schools. In the last five years, no special school has served 20 or more English language learners.*

## **Definition of scores for each criterion**

Points for each of the six criterion described herein will determine the school’s overall rating. The performance achieved for each criterion, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

**Table 1**  
**Definition of scores for each criterion: Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School**

Criterion	Total points available	Definition of score computation
<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>		
GED Passage	20	The score is the average of the percent of students passing each of four GED test sections: (Reading, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science), where 10) The average is expressed as a decimal (.e.g., .874), which is 11) multiplied by 20, and 12) rounded to the nearest whole number.
<b>STUDENT PROGRESS</b>		
TABE Progress	20	The score is the mean gain on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), where the gain is obtained by: 3) subtracting the mean pre-test GE from the mean post-test GE, where 4) mean GEs are reported to 2 decimal points (e.g., 1.73). <i>Use Table 2 to convert this score to points</i>
<b>GED SUCCESS RATE</b>		
GED Success Rate	20	The score is the percent of students who pass the GED among students who: 4) are 16 years or older, and 5) have completed the GED preparation program, which is: 6) Expressed as a decimal (e.g., .782), 7) Multiplied by 20, then 8) Rounded to the nearest whole number
<b>PERFORMANCE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b>		
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	0	Fewer than 20 students are ELP students
<b>POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>		
Positive Learning Environment	10	Results of Student Survey Tool to be determined

PREPARED FOR SUCCESS		
ASVAB	15	The score is: 1) the percent of students who score above the minimum score of 31, expressed as a decimal (e.g., .692), 2) multiplied by 15, then 3) rounded to the nearest whole number.
WorkKeys	15	The score is: 4) the percent of students who received a Silver, Gold, or Platinum certification, expressed as a decimal (e.g., .742), 5) multiplied by 15, then 6) rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Table 2**  
**Conversion Table for Criterion Scores to Points: Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School**


Progress (TABE)		Positive Learning Environment	
Points	Scores	Points	Scores
1	0.55-0.64	1	To be Determined
2	0.65-0.74	2	
3	0.75-0.84	3	
4	0.85-0.94	4	
5	0.95-1.04	5	
6	1.05-1.14	6	
7	1.15-1.24	7	
8	1.25-1.34	8	
9	1.35-1.44	9	
10	1.45-1.54	10	
11	1.55-1.64		
12	1.65-1.74		
13	1.75-1.84		
14	1.85-1.94		
15	1.95-2.04		
16	2.05-2.14		
17	2.15-2.24		
18	2.25-2.34		
19	2.35-2.44		
20	2.45-2.54		

NOTE: The GED Passage Rate, GED Success Rate, as well as the ASVAB and WorkKeys percentages result in numbers which do not require further conversion.

**Table 3**  
**Sample Rating Calculation: Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School**

Criteria	Observed Values	Score/ Computation	Points
<b>Achievement</b>	53.1, 55.5, 58.2, 60.3	$.568 \times 20 = 11.34$	11
<b>Progress (TABE)</b>	19 months (1.7 GE) 18 months (1.6 GE)	1.65	12
<b>GED Success Rate</b>	53.1	$.531 \times 20 = 10.6$	11
<b>Positive Learning Environment</b>			5*
<b>Prepared for Success</b>			
ASVAB	69.2	$.692 \times 15 = 10.40$	10
WorkKeys	56.7	$.567 \times 15 = 8.51$	9
<b>Total</b>			<b>58*</b>

\* assumes the midpoint of the scores for positive learning environment.




**Table 4**  
**Conversion of Points to Ratings: ALL Special Schools**

Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
39 or lower	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 or higher

The following template is designed to provide a visual representation of what a website landing page might look like using these data elements. All data used are for PLACEMENT PURPOSES ONLY.

DRAFT REPORT CARD (sample landing page)
ESPAÑOL | CONTACT | LOGIN

Home OVERVIEW
Student Learning
School Environment
Prepared for Success
Student Opportunities
Finances
Search



# Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School

3300 W. Campus Rd. | West Columbia, SC |

803-896-6480 | www.willougray.org | willougray

- Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School serves “at-risk” young people, ages 16-19 years old, who are on a path toward failing at their current school; dropping out of school; or engaging in an unhealthy, negative lifestyle because of bad choices.

## Performance Rating

# Good

WHAT DOES THE RATING MEAN?

CONTACT SCHOOL

VIEW SCHOOL WEBSITE

### Student Achievement

This component shows the average percent passage on four sections of the General Education Diploma (GED)

VIEW MORE DATA

### Student Growth

This component represents the growth of students on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

VIEW MORE DATA

### GED Success Rate

This component is the percentage of students who pass the GED.

VIEW MORE DATA

DOWNLOAD AS PDF

### Prepared for Success

This component measures the progress students are making on WorkKeys, a career-readiness assessment, as well as the percentage of students scoring at least the minimum score on the Armed Services Vocational Battery (ASVAB).

VIEW MORE DATA

### School Environment

A non-academic component, this measures whether the school has a positive and effective learning environment based on the results of a student survey.

VIEW MORE DATA

*Federal guidelines require the publication of the performance of English Language Learners (ELLs) in a school. There are currently less than 20 ELL students in this school; therefore, ELL performance cannot be reported.*

SHARE

## Appendix G: Report Elements on Report Cards

Headings	ESSA	SC Law	EOC Also Recommends:
<b>Student Learning – Level 1</b>			
<b>Performance compared to state and nation</b> <i>Drill down level 2 under Student Learning</i>		<p>Performance of students in South Carolina on SC Ready to other students' performance on comparable standards in other states with the ability to link scores of the assessment to scales from other assessments.  <i>Section 59-18-325(C)</i></p> <p>NAEP and National Rankings  <i>Section 59-18-930</i></p>	<p>State should publish the state, district, high school and national results of results of the college readiness assessment for the graduating class to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• average composite ACT scores</li> <li>• average ACT score by subtest</li> <li>• percent of ACT-tested high school graduates that meet ACT college readiness benchmarks by subject and by race and ethnicity</li> <li>• percentage of students earning a Silver or better on National Career Readiness Certificate</li> <li>• on-time graduation rate</li> </ul>
<b>Early Literacy &amp; Early Numeracy – Drill down Level 2 under Student Learning</b>	<p>Number and percentage of English learners achieving English language proficiency” (Sec. 1111(h)(1)(c)(iv). English learners are also one of the groups of students for which all other information must be disaggregated</p> <p><i>Sec. 1111(c)(2)(D)</i></p>	<p>Read to Succeed requires progress monitoring by school and district on reading proficiency</p> <p><i>Section 59-155-140</i></p>	<p>Schools and districts report the number of kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade students who are not on track to be reading on a third grade level or who are not on track to be meeting state standards in mathematics by the end of third grade.</p> <p>To be phased in starting with 2nd grade students on 2018 report card; 1st and 2nd graders on 2019 report card; and K, 1st and 2nd graders on the 2020 report card.</p>

Headings	ESSA	SC Law	EOC Also Recommends:
<b>Life &amp; Career Characteristics</b> <i>Drill down Level 2 under Student Learning</i>		<i>Act 195 of 2016</i>	<p>EOC recommends that districts and schools select from a list of approved metrics that determine if students are obtaining life &amp; career characteristics of the <i>Profile of the SC Graduate</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elementary &amp; Middle schools – Report either survey data or data collected from rubrics (i.e. Lexington 4) for grades 3-8.</li> <li>2. High School – At least two districts are piloting Microburst, a soft skills assessment survey.</li> </ol>
<b>Civic Life Readiness</b> <i>-Drill down Level 2 under Student Learning</i>		<p>Percentage of Students passing Civics Test at school and district level</p> <p><i>Section 59-29-240</i></p>	<p><b>Service learning and leadership opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of students involved in ROTC</li> <li>• Percentage of students involved in student government, CATE organizations, clubs</li> <li>• Percentage of students involved in service learning</li> </ul>
<b>Advanced Coursework</b> <i>-Drill down Level 2 under Student Learning and Programs offered</i>	<p>“Number and percentage of students enrolled in ---(bb) accelerated coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school, such as AP and IB courses and examinations, dual or concurrent enrollment programs”</p> <p><i>Sec. 1111(h)(1)(C)(Viii)(II)(bb)</i></p>		<p>In addition to ESSA requirements, reporting information on the <b>success rates</b> of students in advanced coursework, namely:</p> <p>Number of students enrolled in AP or IB course and % students with passing score on AP or IB exam</p> <p>Number of students taking a dual enrollment course and % students earning college credit</p>

Headings	ESSA	SC Law	EOC Also Recommends:
<b>Finances–Level 1</b>	Per pupil expenditures of Federal, State and Local funds, disaggregated by source of funds  <i>Sec. 1111(h)(1)(C)(x)</i>		Additional reporting by school and district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of expenditures for instruction, instructional support, operations, etc. (In\$ite data)</li> <li>• Percent of expenditures for teachers' salaries</li> <li>• Poverty Index</li> </ul>
<b>School Environment Level 1</b>			
<b>School Climate</b> <i>Drill down Level 2 under School Environment</i>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student attendance rate</li> <li>• Rate of chronic absenteeism</li> <li>• Out of school suspensions or expulsions for violent and criminal offense</li> <li>• Results of teacher, parent, student surveys</li> </ul>
<b>Student Characteristics</b> <i>Drill down level 2 under School Environment</i>			Additional reporting by school and district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poverty Index</li> <li>• % of students with disabilities</li> <li>• % of students who are English language learners</li> <li>• Student characteristics (ethnicity, new poverty criteria)</li> </ul>
<b>Prepared for Success Level 1</b>			
<b>Kindergarten Readiness --</b> <i>Drill down level 2 under Prepared for Success</i>			Kindergarten Readiness results by state, county, school district, and school. The new kindergarten readiness assessment will be implemented in school year 2017- 18.  <i>Section 59-152-33 &amp; Section 59-155-150</i>



Headings	ESSA	SC Law	EOC Also Recommends:
<b>College and Career Readiness</b> <i>Drill down level 2 under Prepared for Success</i>	<p>“Cohort rate (in the aggregate, and disaggregated for each subgroup of students defined in subsection(c)(2)), at which students who graduate from the high school enroll, for the first academic year that begins after the students’ graduation – (I) in programs of public postsecondary education in the State; and (II) if data are available and to the extent practicable, in programs of private postsecondary education in the State or programs of postsecondary education outside the State”</p> <p><i>Sec. 1111(h)(1)(C)(Xiii)(1)-(111)</i></p>		<p>ESSA requires SC to report Freshman Report disaggregated by subgroups (% of students form prior year graduating class enrolled in a two or four-year college or technical college pursuing an associate’s degree, certificate)</p> <p>EOC also recommends reporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of seniors who have completed FAFSA Forms</li> <li>• Percentage of Seniors Completing College applications</li> <li>• Percentage of Seniors Eligible for LIFE Scholarship</li> <li>• Number and percentage of students with LIFE scholarship in freshman year and retaining in sophomore year</li> <li>• Percentage of Seniors Eligible for Palmetto Fellows Scholarship</li> <li>• Number and percentage of students who are still enrolled in a four or two-year college after their freshman year</li> <li>• % graduates who earn postsecondary degree 5 or 6 years after graduating from high school</li> <li>• % graduates who are gainfully employed in a living wage job 2 years after graduating from high school</li> </ul>

<p><b>Education &amp; Economic Development Act</b> <i>Drill down level 2 under Prepared for Success</i></p>		<p>EEDA is a critical component for improving college/career readiness of students</p> <p><i>Chapter 59 of Title 59</i></p> <p>Reporting of dropout recovery rate on the annual school and district report cards.</p> <p><i>Proviso 1A.39. of the 2016-17 General Appropriations Act</i></p>	<p>Requirements of the law need to be documented to determine if students are being served:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Dropout Rate</li> <li>• Annual dropout recovery rate</li> <li>• Career clusters offered at each school, career and technology center, and district</li> <li>• Number of students enrolled in each cluster</li> <li>• Number of students who complete each cluster</li> <li>• Number of students completing apprenticeship programs</li> <li>• Percentage of students who have an individual graduation plan</li> <li>• Number of students earning specific national industry credentials</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---

<b>Student Opportunities Level 1</b>		Character Development Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of students served by Gifted &amp; Talented programs</li> <li>• Opportunities in the arts</li> <li>• Opportunities in Foreign Languages</li> <li>• Percentage of students enrolled in foreign language (non-duplicative)</li> <li>• Technology Capabilities of school and district (Bandwidth, internal connections, % of classroom with wireless access, 1:1 capacity, etc.)</li> <li>• Average age of books/electronic media in school library</li> <li>• Number of resources available per student in school library media center</li> <li>• AP courses offered, dual credit opportunities</li> <li>• Montessori...(this is an aread where schools could list what they offer, users could filter results.)</li> </ul>
<b>Advanced Coursework</b> <i>-Drill down Level 2 under Student Opportunities</i>	<p>“Number and percentage of students enrolled in ---(bb) accelerated coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school, such as AP and IB courses and examinations, dual or concurrent enrollment programs”</p> <p><i>Sec. 1111(h)(1)(C)(Viii)(II)(bb)</i></p>		<p>In addition to ESSA requirements, reporting information on the <b>success rates</b> of students in advanced coursework, namely:</p> <p>Number of students enrolled in AP or IB course and % students with passing score on AP or IB exam</p> <p>Number of students taking a dual enrollment course and % students earning college credit</p>

## Appendix H: GEPA Section 427 Statement

The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) complies with the requirements of Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA). The SCDE will comply with all Federal and State Laws to ensure that all persons regardless of race, color, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, citizenship status, disability, gender, or sexual orientation have equitable access to all educational programs, activities, and opportunities provided through Federal and State Law and provided by all relevant federal and state funding.

The SCDE will hold Local Education Agencies (LEA)s accountable for upholding all federal and state laws and regulations relating to equitable access to all educational programs and for providing necessary and reasonable accommodations to meet the needs of all protected classes, including students, staff, and stakeholders.

Examples of SCDE activities designed to ensure equitable access:

- Monitoring of federal programs that include reviewing equitable access requirements;
- Reviewing of LEAs and schools to meet accreditation standards established by the SCDE that include equitable access requirements;
- Reviewing of LEA and school data to review the performance of all students, as well as to review the performance of subgroups of students, and to provide technical assistance as needed;
- Offering language services (e.g., interpreting and translating) for students and parents as appropriate;
- Providing Spanish translated documents related to Part B of the IDEA;
- Providing technologies (e.g., assistive technology devices) in a variety of settings to ensure all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, have equitable access for achievement;
- Providing technical assistance to LEAs and schools to create a positive school climate for all students through programs such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support and anti-bully programs;
- Using a variety of teaching techniques to ensure all students have an opportunity to engage in and have access to a meaningful educational experience. Providing transportation services for homeless, foster, and students with disabilities;
- Providing training and technical assistance to enhance family and parent engagement for all students.

## Appendix I: Glossary of Acronyms

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
<b>9 GR</b>	A code in the student information system that indicates the first year in which a student is in the ninth grade
<b>ACCESS</b>	Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State
<b>ADEPT</b>	Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating the Professional Teaching
<b>ATSI</b>	Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
<b>ACT</b>	American College Testing
<b>AP</b>	Advanced Placement High School courses that culminate in a final exam which can earn the student college credit. Administered by the College Board.
<b>APR</b>	Annual Performance Report
<b>ASA</b>	Academic Standards and Assessments Subcommittee
<b>ASVAB</b>	Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery
<b>CAEP</b>	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
<b>CATE</b>	Career and Technology Education
<b>CCDBG</b>	Child Care Development Block Grant
<b>CCLC</b>	21st Century Community Learning Centers
<b>CCSSO</b>	Council of Chief State School Officers
<b>CDEP</b>	Child Early Reading Development and Education Program
<b>CERRA</b>	Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement
<b>CDGCPM</b>	Comprehensive Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program Model
<b>CHE</b>	The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
<b>CIP</b>	The National Center for Education Statistics' Classification of Instructional Program
<b>CIG</b>	Consortium Incentive Grant
<b>CNA</b>	Comprehensive Needs Assessment
<b>COE</b>	Certificate of Eligibility
<b>CPE</b>	Center for Public Education
<b>CPI</b>	Crisis Prevention Institute
<b>CSI</b>	Comprehensive Support and Improvement
<b>DOL</b>	United States Department of Labor
<b>EAA</b>	Education Accountability Act The South Carolina Legislature passed the EAA in 1998 to establish a system that will measure school performance, provide recognition for high performing schools, and provide technical assistance for low performing schools. The EAA defined the core subject areas in which the state sets academic content standards and assesses student mastery to assess school performance. The focus of the EAA is on summative assessments used to evaluate schools.
<b>ECMHSP</b>	East Coast Migrant Head Start Project
<b>EEDA</b>	Education and Economic Development Act Passed by the South Carolina

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
	Legislature in 2005, the EEDA mandates a system to provide students with individualized educational, academic, and career-oriented choices and greater exposure to career information and opportunities.
<b>EIA</b>	Education Improvement Act
<b>ELA</b>	English Language Arts
<b>EL</b>	English Learners Also ELL for English Language Learners
<b>ELLCO</b>	Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation Tool
<b>ELP</b>	English Language Proficiency
<b>EOC</b>	Education Oversight Committee The South Carolina Education Oversight Committee is an independent, nonpartisan group appointed by the legislature and governor to enact the South Carolina EAA of 1998. The Act sets standards for improving the state's K-12 educational system. By state statute, the EOC has policy responsibility for one component of the state's public k-12 education accountability system, District and School Report Cards, issued annually.
<b>EOCEP</b>	End-Of-Course Examination Program The End-of-Course Examination Program (EOCEP) provides tests in high school core courses and tests for courses taken in middle school for high school credit.
<b>EPP</b>	Educator Preparation Provider
<b>ESEA</b>	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ESEA was passed in 1965 as the first major federal support for education. ESEA emphasizes equal access to education and establishes high standards and accountability. The law authorizes federally funded education programs that are administered by the states. It is generally reauthorized every five to seven years. In 2002, Congress amended ESEA and reauthorized it as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). In 2015, ESEA was reauthorized as the Every Student Succeeds Act.
<b>ESOL</b>	English for Speakers of Other Languages
<b>ESSA</b>	Every Student Succeeds Act The major ESSA Programs (ESEA of 2015) include: Title I: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged Title II: Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students Title IV A: Student Success and Academic Enrichment Title IV B: 21st Century Schools Title V: Rural and Low Income Schools
<b>EVAAS</b>	Education Value-Added Assessment System
<b>FASFA</b>	Free Application for Federal Student Aid
<b>FERPA</b>	The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
<b>GAN</b>	Grant Award Notification
<b>GE</b>	General Education
<b>GEPA</b>	General Education Provisions Act
<b>GED</b>	General Education Development
<b>GPA</b>	Grade Point Average
<b>GT</b>	Gifted and Talented
<b>HHM</b>	Homeless and Highly Mobile
<b>HLS</b>	Home Language Survey
<b>HUD</b>	United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
<b>IB</b>	International Baccalaureate
<b>Id&amp;R</b>	Identification and Recruitment
<b>IDEA</b>	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
<b>IEP</b>	Individualized Education Program
<b>IGP</b>	Individual Graduation Plan
<b>IRT</b>	Item Response Theory
<b>JRE</b>	Job Related Education
<b>LEA</b>	Local Education Agency; the equivalent of a school district
<b>LEP</b>	Limited-English Proficient
<b>LOA</b>	Local Operating Agencies
<b>MDE</b>	Minimum Data Elements
<b>MEP</b>	Education of Migratory Children Program
<b>MIS2000</b>	State Migratory Student Database
<b>MPOs</b>	Measurable Program Objectives and Outcomes
<b>MRM</b>	Multivariate Response Model
<b>MSIX</b>	National Migratory Student Information Exchange
<b>NA</b>	Not Applicable
<b>NAEHCY</b>	National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth
<b>NAEP</b>	National Assessment of Educational Progress
<b>NECS</b>	National Center for Education Statistics
<b>NCRC</b>	National Career Readiness Certificate A certificate issued by ACT. Based upon performance, students may earn a bronze, silver, gold, or platinum certificate.
<b>NCHE</b>	National Center for Homeless Education
<b>N&amp;D</b>	Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk
<b>NPRM</b>	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
<b>OCR</b>	Office of Civil Rights
<b>OCTE</b>	The South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Career and Technology Education
<b>OJT</b>	On the Job Training
<b>OELL</b>	The South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Early Learning and

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
	Literacy
<b>OME</b>	USED's Office of Migrant Education
<b>OSes</b>	The South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Special Education Services
<b>OSEP</b>	The United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs
<b>OSY</b>	Out-of-School Youth
<b>PADEPP</b>	Program for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Principal Performance
<b>PAC</b>	Parent Advisory Council
<b>PACE</b>	Program for Alternative Certification of Educators
<b>PD</b>	Professional Development
<b>PFS</b>	Priority for Services
<b>PIP</b>	Principal Induction Program
<b>PK</b>	Pre-Kindergarten
<b>PLD</b>	Performance Level Descriptors
<b>PLO</b>	Professional Learning Opportunities
<b>PTA/PTO</b>	Parent Teacher Association/Parent Teacher Organization
<b>RLIS</b>	Rural and Low-Income Schools
<b>RFP</b>	Request for Proposal
<b>RTI</b>	Response to Intervention A research-based intervention that is aligned with the federal turnaround principles.
<b>SAT</b>	Scholastic Aptitude Test
<b>SBE</b>	State Board of Education The State Board of Education is the body responsible for public elementary and secondary education in South Carolina. The Board consists of 17 members, one appointed from each of the state's 16 judicial circuits by the legislative delegations representing the various circuits and one member appointed by the governor. Members are appointed for four-year terms.
<b>SCASA</b>	South Carolina Association of School Administrators
<b>SCDJJ</b>	South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice
<b>SCETV</b>	South Carolina Educational Television
<b>SCDSS</b>	South Carolina Department of Social Services
<b>SC-Alt</b>	South Carolina Alternate Assessment The SC-Alt is an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed against alternate achievement standards, as they are unable to participate in the general assessment program even with accommodations. The SC-Alt is administered to students who meet the participation guidelines for alternate assessment and who are ages 8–13 years and age 15 years, as of September 1 of the assessment year. (These are the ages



<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
	<p>of students who are typically in grades 3–8 and grade 10).</p> <p>The SC-Alt assessment consists of a series of performance tasks that are linked to the grade level academic standards, although at a less complex level. Each task is aligned to an assessment standard and measurement guideline or extended standard linked to the grade level content.</p>
<b>SCDE</b>	<p>South Carolina State Department of Education</p> <p>The SCDE governs the executive functions of K-12 public education in the state. The SCDE's mission is to ensure that every South Carolina student acquires an education that provides the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to succeed in careers or college as a contributing member of society. The SCDE ensures that the public schools of the state adhere to the statutes passed by the General Assembly and the regulations promulgated by the State Board of Education.</p>
<b>SCGSAH</b>	South Carolina Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities
<b>SCGSSM</b>	South Carolina Governor's School for Science and Mathematics
<b>SCSDB</b>	South Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind
<b>SCOIS</b>	South Carolina Occupational Information System
<b>SCPASS</b>	<p>South Carolina Palmetto Assessment of State Standards</p> <p>The SCPASS is a series of achievement tests administered to elementary and middle school students (in 3rd and 8th grade) in science and social studies. SCPASS is used in calculating school and district ratings for the state and federal accountability systems.</p>
<b>SC READY</b>	<p>South Carolina College-and Career-Ready Assessments (SC READY)</p> <p>The South Carolina College-and Career-Ready Assessments (SC READY) are statewide assessments in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics that will meet all of the requirements of Acts 155 and 200, ESEA , IDEA, and the Assessments Peer Review guidance.</p> <p>All students in grades 3–8 are required to take the SC READY except those students with significant cognitive disabilities who qualify for the South Carolina National Center and State Collaborative (SC-NCSC) alternate assessment.</p>
<b>SCSBA</b>	South Carolina School Boards Association
<b>SCTCS</b>	South Carolina Technical College System
<b>SDP</b>	State Service Delivery Plan
<b>SEA</b>	State Educational Agency - South Carolina Department of Education
<b>SIAG</b>	School Improvement Advisory Group
<b>SLO</b>	Student Learning Objective
<b>SOP</b>	State Operated Programs
<b>SOSOSY</b>	Strategies, Opportunities, and Services for Out of School Youth
<b>SPP</b>	State Performance Plan
<b>SRO</b>	School Resource Officer
<b>SSIP</b>	State Systemic Improvement Plan

<b>ACRONYM</b>	<b>ACRONYM DEFINED</b>
<b>STEM</b>	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics subject areas
<b>TA Funds</b>	State Technical Assistance funds support struggling schools being served as expressly outlined in their improvement plans.
<b>TABE</b>	Test of Adult Basic Education
<b>TAR</b>	Testing and Accountability Roundtable
<b>TBD</b>	To Be Determined
<b>TFA</b>	Teach for America
<b>TSI</b>	Targeted Support and Improvement
<b>URM</b>	Univariate Response Model. A regression-based modeling approach that measures the difference between students' predicted scores for a particular subject/year with their observed scores.
<b>UGG</b>	Uniform Grant Guidance
<b>UGP</b>	Uniform Grading Policy
<b>USDA</b>	United States Department of Agriculture
<b>USED</b>	United States Department of Education
<b>W-APT</b>	WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test
<b>WIDA</b>	The World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortia Composed of 35 member states; supports academic language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students.
<b>WIOA</b>	Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act