

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RACE TO THE TOP

GRANT REVIEW

Phase 1 tier 2 State Presentation

The State of South Carolina

8:30 a.m.

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

Holiday Inn Capitol Hill
550 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 DR. REX: Well, good morning, everyone. My name
3 is Jim Rex. I'm the chief in South Carolina. And let me
4 briefly introduce the rest of the panel. I'll go down at
5 the far right here is Dr. Betsy Carpentier who is our
6 Deputy Superintendent for Innovation and Support. Next to
7 her is Dr. Janice Poda who is our Deputy Superintendent
8 for Administration at the State Department of Education.
9 Next to her is Dr. Valerie Harrison who is our Deputy
10 Superintendent for Standards and Learning. And next to me
11 is Dr. Gerrita Postlewait who is among other things, the
12 Chair-elect of the South State Board of Education.

13 I'm going to read some of my brief remarks here
14 because of time being so valuable. So please bear with
15 me. This team that you see before you is the team that
16 actually led the effort of many people in our state and
17 organized that effort to write the proposal you have seen.
18 And needless to say, we're very pleased to be here this
19 morning. We're proud of our proposal and I think your
20 initial review has validated that pride. So for that, we
21 thank you. I think we all understand the difficulty of
22 your task and it's our intention to try to use this 30
23 minutes efficiently so there will be perhaps even some
24 additional time for dialogue.

1 In a moment, Betsy Carpentier will share some
2 slides that we hope will help frame our proposal and
3 summarize its many features, but first just a couple of
4 points that I want to make. Part of our challenge,
5 frankly, in writing our proposal on South Carolina was to
6 make sure that we integrated the many efforts that are
7 already underway in our state in the four assurance areas.
8 And to make it clear, and hopefully we have, that we have
9 already begun, we believe, to run the Race to the Top and
10 that we intend to continue our efforts just as we did,
11 frankly, in the late 1990s when we passed accountability
12 legislation and put in rigorous academic standards three
13 years before No Child Left Behind. And even after No
14 Child Left Behind came into effect and created some
15 unintended consequences that actually incentivized some
16 states in this country to shoot low and sort of gain the
17 system, South Carolina did not. We stuck with our
18 original rigor and as you know, I hope, we have been
19 consistently rated at or near the top in the nation in
20 student and educator expectations.

21 In South Carolina, I believe we have
22 demonstrated that we have created a culture of
23 collaboration that is unusual if not unique. A couple of
24 quick examples - on a monthly basis - and this has been

1 going on for a number of years now - I meet with every
2 district superintendent, all 86 of them on a monthly
3 basis. With the leadership team of the state department
4 we meet at least twice a year. With all of the deans of
5 all of the preparation programs in the state both public
6 and private we have this program called the Palmetto
7 Priority School Collaboration which is talked about in our
8 proposal. That's a unique collaboration, we believe, that
9 includes not just superintendents, not just the principles
10 of the struggling schools, it includes the chair of the
11 local school board along with the state superintendent and
12 others. So that collaboration has taught us a lot. And
13 we found out in the first year that our 16 lowest
14 performing schools, that eight of them actually met
15 adequate yearly progress in our state and some even met
16 AYP. So we're learning. And we've been at it for a
17 while. I also want to point out that this culture
18 permeates the state agency itself. We've restructured the
19 State Department of Education. We did that two and a half
20 years ago. We've created an Office of Choice, an Office
21 of Innovation. We have cross-divisional teaming and
22 collaboration. When we talk in the proposal about a new
23 deputy and a new division, this will be integrated fully
24 into the agency. That's the way we do everything and you

1 have some deputies here that can verify that.

2 In our proposal, we talk about the smart center
3 approach and we think that it is compelling. The
4 comprehensive longitudinal information and data systems
5 that we already have and that we can improve upon with
6 your help, the interventions that we described with
7 struggling schools, what we call turnaround schools in
8 South Carolina, these are not abstractions in our state.
9 These are things that for the most part we've already
10 engaged in and learned from. We are talking in this
11 proposal, of course, about further development of what you
12 could call a NESCID system directed at all teachers as
13 well as the whole, the whole teacher, and all students as
14 well as the whole student. This system, we believe, will
15 provide actionable information to policymakers, schools,
16 teachers, parents and students.

17 Now in my career and some of the other people in
18 front of you, we've done some of what you're doing now,
19 but never in the circumstances that you find yourselves
20 in, nothing that's ever approached, frankly, the
21 significance of your efforts. And I want you to know that
22 we all fully understand that this is an amazing moment in
23 time in America and a moment when all of us must recognize
24 that we need to put forth the best we have to offer. I

1 suspect that one of your challenges is trying to ascertain
2 the state capacity of these proposals, what can states
3 really do. And I don't know about you, I'm probably older
4 than anyone else on your - anyone on your panel, but as
5 I've gotten older, I've learned to place less emphasis on
6 what people say or write and more on what they do. I've
7 learned that the best predictor of future behavior is past
8 behavior. And I've also learned that often simply doing
9 the right thing is not enough. It's the pace, it's the
10 urgency with which you do that. And I've learned long ago
11 that you can do the right thing, but you can do it so
12 slowly that you end up getting the same results as doing
13 the wrong thing. And I hope you'll agree with us after
14 this time together that South Carolina has not just walked
15 the walk, that we have run the run of educational reform
16 and with your help, we think we can pick up the pace in
17 such a way as to help transform learning not just in our
18 state, but hopefully in our nation.

19 Now I'm going to ask Betsy Carpentier to - who
20 by the way, quarterbacked this whole process. She says
21 she was the conductor. I say she was the quarterback.
22 But nonetheless, Betsy's going to review some of the major
23 features.

24 DR. CARPENTIER: Thank you. I'm going to quickly

1 go through these slides and I hope that by the end of it
2 you'll realize that we do have the experience and capacity
3 to implement innovative plans that will have a broad and
4 deep impact and that we can do it quickly building on
5 momentum that we already have going in our state. As the
6 Department of Education which is the lead agency in South
7 Carolina, our motto is "together we can," and we've
8 modified that for this Race to the Top application to say
9 "together we are." Because we are already doing a lot of
10 the reforms and have them underway in our state.

11 Our application overall plan is called South
12 Carolina Inspired because we are proposing innovative
13 ideas which will generate generation learners. We're
14 transitioning to enhance standards and assessments, to
15 develop personalized instruction for every student,
16 building on the input from all of our stakeholder,
17 creating choice within our schools and for our
18 stakeholders resulting in redefined schools and turned
19 around schools that are highly effective with highly
20 effective teachers and leaders all based on data to use
21 and making decisions about learning and other decisions
22 about public education. So Dr. Rex said the best
23 predictor of the future is what South Carolina's already
24 done. And although we have a lot of examples of things

1 we've already done in our application, we picked one to
2 talk to you about today - the 2010 Quality Counts Report.
3 As you know, it has several pieces and in the teaching
4 profession, and in the Teaching Profession piece Carolina
5 was rated number one in the nation. We go the only "A" in
6 the country at 95.8 percent. The next rating was at an
7 88. As far as standards and assessments our direct
8 mention that we have very high standards. We also got an
9 "A" for that in the Quality Counts Report, rated seventh
10 in the country. And overall, our state was rated 11th. So
11 we're very proud of that and I think you can see from that
12 that it's not just us telling you that we have the
13 experience and can do it, but independent folks have rated
14 us as high in the country for doing these things.

15 One of the things that you're interested in is
16 our ability to manage and our capacity to do that. We
17 have districts who have signed on, over 95 percent of our
18 districts, over 98 percent of our students and students in
19 poverty and almost 98 percent of our schools are signed up
20 for this application. We plan to do it through our
21 regional launch centers, and you've seen that acronym I'm
22 sure in our application. And this diagram depicts the
23 management of the application as you can see, there's
24 state departments over the application, but we have the

1 State Board of Education, a new Regional Advisory Board, a
2 new division and our cross-divisional teams all working
3 through the smart centers which will be enhanced which
4 will be enhanced by additional staff.

5 Now I know that we're supposed to only have
6 things that are in our application and one of the things
7 we tried to do is give you some citations of where all
8 these things are. So these slides aren't pretty, but they
9 give you where all the information is on the advisory team
10 on the new project division and how they're going to
11 actually manage the application. This one is where the
12 information on the additional staff for the smart centers
13 is. And this one has the information on the cross-
14 divisional teams and the other divisions within the
15 agencies that are also intimately part of our Race to the
16 Top plan. In addition to the department, there are other
17 state partners. And this slide gives you citations to
18 where the references to those other state partners are.

19 Part B of our application relates to enhanced
20 standards and assessments. This slide gives you basically
21 a summary of the entire Part B where we're focusing on our
22 existing SCubed curriculums, standard system support
23 system that's already out there to create next generation
24 learners. This is the existing website that's already out

1 there that teachers can go to and we'll be building on
2 that to allow the teachers to have curriculum resources,
3 pacing guides, scope and sequence and all the things they
4 need to make a difference in the classroom.

5 South Carolina passed the Education Economic
6 Development Act. Part of that is a career and college
7 focus. This is a screen shot of our individual graduation
8 plan that's part of that. Also as part of the EEDA we
9 have the nation's first national course alignment project
10 where we're taking high school teachers and entry-level
11 college teachers and pairing up the courses. We have 17
12 paired courses that we're already piloting. And we would
13 be using Race to the Top funds to amend those materials
14 for the new standard. Also as part of the EEDA, every
15 student has to declare a major when they get into high
16 school and begin a career cluster. And this is a
17 progression of one of those career clusters for a green
18 engineering program. You can see it goes all the way back
19 to kindergarten, elementary school and through two- or
20 four-year college and careers. It lists some of the
21 activities and courses that you would take. The green
22 engineer, you want to - particularly interesting for us
23 and we have application requests for some green
24 engineering labs in our program because we're focusing on

1 our high need schools in a high poverty area with high
2 unemployment, hoping to build jobs in our state along our
3 Interstate 95 corridor.

4 So to sum up section B, we know that we have to
5 focus on what goes on in the classroom with our teachers
6 and have personalized instruction for next-generation
7 learners if we're really going to make a difference with
8 our students.

9 Section C talks about data systems. We know
10 that they support all of our efforts and this diagram is a
11 depiction of that. We have the educators, the standards
12 and turning around struggling schools all supported by the
13 data system which is the middle circle. All of those
14 intersect at different places, but the data is underneath
15 all of that.

16 One of the things that I find particularly
17 interesting is our integrated data base. This is our
18 priority five that you'll find in our application and a
19 black and white version of this diagram is on page 218.
20 But by having information on our social services,
21 healthcare, behavioral service and law enforcement, we
22 have information that policymakers and researchers can use
23 to look at the whole child in the whole psycho-social
24 context for next generation learners. Education will be a

1 part of that. We've already developed pieces of our
2 longitudinal data system and would expand that and have
3 extra governance under this grant or the SLBS grant if we
4 get one of those. The piece I want to focus on here is
5 the yellow box on the right hand side, our curriculum
6 management system. That system is going to pull
7 information from our SLBS and our student information
8 system but also from the SCubed curriculum, from learning
9 plans, from instructional materials and feedback from the
10 program effectiveness which is in the bottom portion of
11 that. And that green arrow that comes down here is all
12 going to come out into an intruded interface for
13 educators. This is a screen shot of what that might look
14 like. On the right hand side you see our program for at-
15 risk indicators. So this student has an "n" for not at-
16 risk at this point under our new at-risk system that's
17 already underway. On the left hand side you see the
18 various programs they can connect to. There's four tabs
19 for each of the four tested areas - BLA, math, science and
20 social studies. At the top it indicates what the student
21 successfully completed and what they haven't. The
22 academic growth box tells you where the student started
23 and where we expect the student to get to by the end of
24 that year. The academic resources box is what we're

1 calling the Netflix model. You look at what the student
2 has not successfully completed and we look at other
3 students who are like that and look at the program that
4 that student used in order to successfully complete what
5 they needed to get done. And so it recommends other
6 programs the student might have and it also recommends
7 teaches who have already done that so that we can build
8 professional learning communities among the teachers. And
9 the last box down there is similar students. The teacher
10 has a suggestion for grouping of similar students that
11 have the same needs.

12 So that's just the student portion of that, but
13 we like to call it the faster model because you can also
14 build that into a fast model, a summary of the classes for
15 the teacher, a summary of the teachers for the school, a
16 summary of the schools for the district and a summary of
17 all the districts for the state. So we'll have intuitive
18 interfaces for all of that.

19 Section D is our equitable distribution of
20 effective teachers and leaders. We're planning in our
21 grant to build on our existing experience with the
22 alternative certification program that we call Pace to add
23 one more principal and also to add sort of a Pace on
24 steroids, Palmetto Teacher Certification Program for

1 enhanced recruitment in our high needs areas because we
2 know we need to grow our own in those areas. It's very
3 hard to recruit teachers into those areas. So part of our
4 application does that. In addition, not on here but
5 mentioned in our application is our new adjunct
6 certification where we bring in career changers who have
7 experience. Bill Gates couldn't teach in our state
8 because he doesn't have a college degree. But people with
9 a college degree and experience would be able to get an
10 adjunct certification in our schools.

11 We plan to shift our focus not away from high
12 quality teachers, but into effective educators. This
13 slide depicts how we're going to shift to having a
14 substantial factor in our evaluation be the effectiveness
15 of our teachers. We've already got statewide systems. We
16 call it ADEP for teachers and PADEPP for principals. So
17 uniform systems and so we're going to have 100 percent of
18 our teachers and principals on this when it's implemented
19 even though you didn't get 100 percent of our district
20 signed up. So this depicts how all of that's got to work.
21 We've already got experience with our 43 TAP schools and
22 our 9-plus schools where we blended the value-added system
23 with our ADEP teacher evaluation system. So we have that
24 experience and what we plan to do is to get input from our

1 stakeholders which we feel is very important and is the
2 second "I" in inspired - and build that system with their
3 support and commitment. Part of that effectiveness rating
4 will get tied back to our college [inaudible] plus the
5 university is currently piloting with us what we call
6 Project Heat. And I can't remember [inaudible], but it's
7 the tying back to the colleges of education and the
8 effectiveness ratings of our students. And as we work
9 through that pilot we'll be expanding that other colleges
10 of education, and if you look at our letters of support in
11 Appendix A you'll see we had 24 out of 31 of our IGs in
12 colleges of ed wound up to be with us on this application.

13 Section E is related to turning around
14 struggling schools and we decided not to use Race to the
15 Top for the 5 percent persistently lowest achieving
16 schools. We're using our school improvement grant, but
17 integrating our fund sources that way. But we did address
18 two additional tiers of schools that are struggling - the
19 Palmetto Priority Schools that are not part of the 5
20 percent PLAS and what we're calling the Improvement
21 Cluster Schools which you'll find in Section B of our
22 application. We know that working together in a network
23 and cluster works because as Dr. Rex mentioned our
24 Palmetto Priority Schools are already doing it and 50

1 percent of those schools met expected progress under our
2 state system within one year. So we're going to build on
3 that model with two additional tiers of schools under
4 Section E.

5 You know that we asked for \$299 million. The ten
6 projects are listed on the screen on the left hand side
7 and if you want a six-page summary of those projects which
8 you might after 1251 pages, if you look at page G2 and
9 Appendix G, our budget summary narrative. It's got six
10 pages that describes those projects. Although we although
11 we have 149.9 million above the line in our budget, nearly
12 \$57 million of that is going to be used by the state and
13 our management of this program and fully \$242.8 million is
14 used by the school districts to implement. We've got
15 themes on how we're going to implement this grant. And
16 I'm going to just run through those. And again, this has
17 got some relatively ugly slides but have citations in the
18 way they do it. The first one is the management team
19 which we already covered, so I'm just reminding you that
20 we did that. The second is to start with the end in mind.
21 We need to be sustainable. We need to be able to scale
22 up. So we're looking to build infrastructure with this
23 money. We're looking to build on our statewide systems.
24 We're looking to build local capacity because we don't

1 have the capacity at the state level to do it statewide.
2 We're going to do it with regional delivery. We're going
3 to record all of the training and [inaudible] we have and
4 have it out on the web. We're going to repurpose
5 resources. For example, we have a current system that we
6 call the Site for Teacher Salary. We'll be repurposing
7 that money under the effectiveness rating. And then we're
8 going to build on the momentum that we already have. So
9 this slide gives you some citations to some of the things
10 on building infrastructure. This slide gives you
11 citations to some of the things on the state level systems
12 that we already have in place and plan to use. This slide
13 gives you information on the building of capacity. And
14 the blue items on this slide - we do plan to have an
15 annual conference to share what's going on with all of
16 that and we do plan to use some of our money for
17 implementation rubrics and I've got the sites there for
18 you. But you have one small piece for an external
19 evaluator in the turnaround section and for some protocol
20 for the most part we're relying on the IDS evaluation
21 team.

22 Our third theme in implementation is that the
23 participating LEAs are going to pilot and implement under
24 this grant. So they're getting the \$242.8 million. We

1 will be developing our exhibit twos to have all their
2 activities, timelines, budgets, key performance measures.
3 Those will be monitored by the staff in the new division.
4 And one of the things that we did with the stabilization
5 fund is we asked every district to tell us what they're
6 already doing under the four key reforms. So we've got
7 those reports and there's an example of one of those in
8 Appendix A. And we've planned to group districts to work
9 together on the different projects as part of their
10 [inaudible]. So that's a major portion of how we plan to
11 get this implemented.

12 Another theme, number four is that we plan to
13 leverage our existing systems and resources that we're
14 talking about collaborating with other states on portions
15 of it. And again, I've got citations there for you. We
16 want to use all of our funding sources. We want to
17 leverage our stakeholder expertise authority out there.
18 As I already mentioned, use the IES evaluations. So these
19 are some citations to some of the foundations we plan to
20 build on such as our virtual school program and our TAP
21 schools. These are some citations to some of the uniform
22 state systems that we have out there such as our - we have
23 a uniform student information system, we have the uniform
24 ADEP evaluation system, we have the uniform PADEPP

1 evaluations system. And we're planning to add a uniform
2 educator ID not just for teachers but for all educators,
3 for example, school psychologists and counselors and
4 others in the school, and to have a program ID which will
5 allow us to track what's the impact of 21st century
6 community learning centers, what's the impact of Reading
7 First, what's the impact of this professional development
8 that this teacher's got? Each teacher will have a record
9 just like a student information system record in our
10 uniform E-portfolio system. So we'll be able to look at
11 return on investment of professional development.

12 A fifth theme is that we plan to, again, involve
13 stakeholders to get their commitment and to make sure that
14 it's sustainable and the blue items on here are the new
15 ones under the grant, but we've lots of stakeholder input
16 and you saw the list of folks who came to our stakeholder
17 meetings in planning for this grant.

18 And then sixth theme is to identify, scale up
19 and share best practices. So again, we're using data
20 through it all. We are building implementation rubrics so
21 that we can monitor and adjust as we go along, and also
22 have that for national models when we get done. We're
23 building protocols. We're taking our lessons learned and
24 turning that into expert systems so that we can scale up

1 and have it be sustainable, then use our data to figure
2 out what is the best and to scale up from that, share it
3 with annual conferences and web reporting and then work
4 with IES on the evaluations component of that.

5 So this is a summary of those 16, again, for the
6 \$299.8 million. And that's South Carolina [inaudible].
7 I'll turn it over to Dr. Rex and Gerrita.

8 DR. REX: Yeah. I just want to introduce again
9 to you, Dr. Gerrita Postlewait. As I said, she's our
10 Chair-elect of our state board. She also is former
11 Superintendent of the Year in the state of South Carolina,
12 and she's the Chief K-12 Officer for the Stepski
13 Foundation so you can imagine how thrilled we are to have
14 her in a leadership role on our state board. So, Gerrita,
15 would you like to make some comments?

16 DR. POSTLEWAIT: Thanks, Dr. Rex. And Betsy,
17 thank you. That was really quite an impressive drive by
18 or fly by. [laughter] A decade's worth of work.

19 So I'd like to just make three points in closing
20 for our team. The first is that from the perspective of a
21 practitioner who spent 10 years as a district
22 superintendent in South Carolina with the opportunity to
23 see things from the state level and get a peek at the
24 national landscape perspective, one of the things that I -

1 and I am deeply impressed with this plan, is its
2 comprehensiveness, its full intent to go toward systemic
3 restructure and understanding that the system that we've
4 inherited will not meet the mission that we currently hold
5 for today's children and that we must fundamentally commit
6 to figuring out how to redesign and recombine its pieces.
7 So systemic reform from three levels - it's a nested
8 system viewing the entity from the state, district,
9 school, classroom perspective, but centered on the
10 student. And if you notice that the kinds of
11 technological applications we envision, it will allow us
12 at the state board level to think about the right policy
13 parameters to catalyze the kind of activities that are
14 making a difference for kids and to incentivize them in
15 real time so that our policies aren't based on a best
16 guess of what a trickle down impact of a good policy would
17 be, but on strong evidence of what's working for children
18 and in an intentional way, then, we can try to create
19 conditions that would allow those best practices that
20 create a dramatic improvement in learning to scale. It
21 allows us to think beyond the basic measures that we've
22 used in the past to much more robust qualitative and
23 quantitative measures of student success. Secondly, it's
24 connected to all the work that we've done in the past, and

1 it relies for its success upon the input of the users who
2 are actually operationalizing the system. It relies on
3 the immediate feedback that we get from those who are
4 fairly rapidly implementing some innovative practices and
5 using the results that they're seeing with students to
6 help us more rapidly prototype ideas that may in fact
7 prove to be tremendously effective with the many students
8 who have historically been disenfranchised from the
9 opportunity that America's education offers.

10 And finally, I'd like to reassure this group
11 that the state board is totally committed to this plan.
12 There is a continuity of commitment. I this year's goals,
13 the state board began adopting some of the components that
14 are contained in the Race to the Top proposal, and it's
15 our intent each year to continue building out our own
16 state board goals in a way that supports and promotes this
17 work. I think it would be fair to describe the state
18 board's feelings about this plan as a board that is
19 genuinely, deeply determined to commit all of our
20 resources, both our political resources and our ability to
21 use the bully pulpit, our ability to influence the
22 thoughts and actions of others in our state to bring
23 coherence and support for this plan. So that's the least
24 we feel we can do for a team of practitioners who

1 represent the kind of spirit and determination that you'll
2 find pretty much throughout South Carolina's public
3 schools. Thank you very much.

4 DR. REX: And I would like the record to show we
5 saved two minutes for you. [laughter]

6 MS. Corinne Sauri: Okay. So thank you for your
7 presentations. [inaudible] I'm going to reset the clock
8 now for the question and answer session.

9 DR. CARPENTIER: I don't know if this is
10 appropriate, but one of the questions we had is if you
11 know how many questions you have so we can sort of set
12 time for ourselves in responding to you?

13 MS. Corinne Sauri: The reviewers are actually
14 responsible for tracking their own time.

15 DR. CARPENTIER: All right. So feel fine to go.
16 [laughter]

17 Reviewer 1: All right. Thank you. Thank you
18 very much for your presentation. We certainly appreciate
19 the great overview of a very comprehensive proposal. So
20 we have some questions for you. We tried to group our
21 questions very much as you did your presentation - more or
22 less in the order of the criteria within the [inaudible]
23 so it would be a little more coherent questioning session.
24 So we are going to start basically with the first part

1 which has to do with your general state reform agenda and
2 a couple of the questions under that category [inaudible].
3 And we'll start with Reviewer 2.

4 REVIEWER 2: I have a question about statewide
5 capacity. And if you all could provide some more detail
6 about the levels of stakeholder support and the
7 commitments of various stakeholder groups to the Race to
8 the Top. And specifically, how the teachers'
9 organizations support Race to the Top to help ensure the
10 success of the program.

11 DR. CARPENTIER: Well, I think if you look at
12 our letters of support, you will see letters of support
13 from the Palmetto State Teachers' Association, the South
14 Carolina Educators' Association as well as our team of the
15 Teachers of Excellence which are the winners of our
16 Teachers of the Year and our Milken Award Winners. So we
17 have broad teacher support within South Carolina for
18 implementation of this plan.

19 In addition, as far as the other stakeholders,
20 we've got within Appendix A the list of people that came
21 to our Stakeholders Meeting and who fully participated,
22 spent a whole day on one of the times working with us on
23 the plan, provided input and feedback and we amended what
24 we were doing based on that input from them.

1 I think our LEAs who are part of our
2 stakeholders are very committed to actually doing what's
3 in our memorandum of understanding. Our Exhibit 3 is
4 pretty detailed. I don't know if you've looked at it, but
5 we had 14 sections with 51 items - those districts have
6 agreed to implement. So they're going to take their
7 Exhibit 2 and be more detailed about how they'll spend
8 their money, but they're getting out of the \$150 million,
9 half of it. But they already committed to that and we
10 have people, you know, raring to go with that. Some of
11 the other stakeholders [inaudible].

12 DR. PODA: I was just going to add the first
13 call I got of congratulations for us being a finalist was
14 from the President of the SCEA. And the statement she
15 made was, "What can I do to help?" And I think that's the
16 kind of spirit we have.

17 DR. REX: The only thing I would add to that is
18 this - most of this commitment is not just in time
19 commitment, you know, for the Race to the Top. If you look
20 at the groups we've been working with, this has been going
21 on for some time. So it didn't happen because there was a
22 pot of gold waiting at the - in Washington, D.C.

23 DR. CARPENTIER: You will also notice support
24 from the New Carolina Group which is a group of

1 businessmen. We've got support from the State Chamber of
2 Commerce. We've got support from the Columbia Urban
3 League. I mean, we've got broad stakeholder support of
4 people who came to the meetings, reviewed our plan and
5 wrote letters of support in Appendix 8.

6 REVIEWER 3: Let me follow up and probe a little
7 bit deeper. We noticed in your proposal that in the
8 memorandum of understanding that you listed "na" for
9 teachers. And just for the record, clarify why you put
10 "na" at that point.

11 DR. POSTLEWAIT: The application asked for
12 teachers' unions. We don't have teachers' unions in South
13 Carolina. We're a right to work state and so we -
14 although we don't have unions and didn't have a union
15 organization to get signed off in every district, we do
16 have teacher associations, so that's - the two
17 associations are what we had sign off on behalf of the
18 [simultaneous conversation].

19 REVIEWER 3: Did you have any teacher
20 association representation sign on at the district level?

21 DR. POSTLEWAIT: I don't know that we have
22 district levels associations in our state.

23 DR. REX: We don't.

24 DR. PODA: Some do but it's about 15 percent of

1 the teachers in the state belong to an education
2 association.

3 REVIEWER 3: Say that again.

4 DR. PODA: Fifteen percent of the teachers --

5 REVIEWER 3: -- belong to an education
6 association. Interesting. Very helpful. Another
7 question. We noticed in some of you LEAs on the
8 memorandum of understanding that some of them reserved the
9 right to opt out. Explain that to us.

10 DR. CARPENTIER: Some of them are concerned
11 about their capacity to implement. We've had severe
12 budget cuts in our state and some of the things we're
13 asking them to do are expensive, so some of them wanted to
14 reserve the opportunity to opt out. But as we reviewed
15 it, they're in it now, and so we counted them as being
16 participating LEAs in our application. That would
17 probably work its way out in our Exhibit 2s when we'll
18 have their budgets and we'll have their implementation
19 plans. And we realized that if they opt out within that
20 90 days that it could impact our award. But right now
21 we're counting them as all signed up and ready to go. And
22 I think the momentum that's building. When Janice found
23 out that we were a finalist, they were actually at one of
24 our superintendents' roundtable meetings and they stood up

1 and applauded. I mean, these superintendents are really
2 behind us.

3 REVIEWER 3: Okay. One last question. Talk to
4 us just for a minute about the level of support at the
5 policymaker level. Because ultimately we know for this
6 thing to work, you've got to have governor, lieutenant
7 governor, legislature, all of that kind of level of
8 support. Talk to us about that.

9 DR. REX: Let me start out. You know our state
10 like many states, [Reviewer 3], is going through a
11 transition. We're going to have a new governor which
12 frankly we're not displeased about. We're going to have a
13 new chief if I'm not running again. It's an elected
14 office in South Carolina. One of the many reasons that
15 Dr. Postelwait is a part of this effort today is to give
16 you assurances that the State Board of Education has that
17 continuity of leadership and commitment. Now, I think
18 when I talked earlier about this culture, I mean, it's
19 here in our state. It's been in place for well over a
20 decade. So really, no matter who the next governor is, no
21 matter who the next chief is, I mean, there's a commitment
22 as far as the state of South Carolina is concerned at the
23 district level, at the state level to implement this with
24 fidelity. You know, we could have some unexpected bonuses

1 depending on how this election comes out in 2010, but I
2 feel very confident that the state is committed at every
3 level especially among policy makers.

4 REVIEWER 3: What about, just real quickly, what
5 about the legislature. Tell us about where they are on
6 this.

7 DR. REX: Well, our legislature supports it.
8 Our legislature, depending on the outcome of any given
9 election, you know, swings one way or the other some in
10 terms of its support for public ed and in terms of how
11 much money and how many resources it's going to allocate.
12 I don't think we're any different than any other state in
13 that regard. But all of the polling shows, all of the
14 elections show that whether you mean it or not, you've got
15 to run as a pro-public education legislator. Now some of
16 them say it but don't do it. I suspect you might have
17 that problem in your states too, but, you know, I feel
18 confident that the ebb and flow of elections are not going
19 to affect in any way the commitment we have as a state.

20 DR. CARPENTIER: And we do have letters of
21 support in Appendix A from the chairs of the education
22 committees and the House and the Senate in South Carolina.
23 We do have that support and almost half of our state
24 budget every year goes to public education.

1 REVIEWER 3: Good. Thank you.

2 REVIEWER 1: Thank you. Okay. In the interest
3 of time, we'll move to kind of a combination of questions.
4 We're going to combine questions about standards
5 assessment and data systems. And we're going to go ahead
6 and go back with [REVIEWER 3] to start that.

7 REVIEWER 3: I promise, I will not be doing this
8 much longer. Based on the information provided in your
9 application, please explain South Carolina's performance
10 and trend lines on MATE, state assessments, and your
11 analysis of future performance projections. And include
12 in that the data you provided for us the last year, the
13 most recent year, exactly what year was that?

14 DR. CARPENTIER: I'll start with the goals that
15 were in Section A. What we did was we included the most
16 recent years past test data for those goals. We switched
17 tests between 07/08 and 08/09, so the last set of data is
18 under the new test. But we took trend lines on the ESBA
19 test to set the goals in Section 8 from that. We don't
20 have a new test for high school so we used just the
21 regular data for that and we used our trends of graduation
22 rate data to set a really ambitious but we think
23 achievable goal of increasing graduation rates by 1600
24 students per year for one-time graduation. Now I think

1 the performance measures in Section B were done on a
2 little bit different data. Valerie, you want to talk
3 about that?

4 DR. HARRISON: The performance goals in Section
5 B were based on PAT assessments and that is the test that
6 we had previous to PAT. In these tests, we started to
7 work on this proposal, we had PAT data there, the Palmetto
8 Achievement Challenge Test. And so we were shifting to
9 another test and so we used that information to determine
10 the performance measures. We figured that that would give
11 us more years of data to use and to make those projections
12 in that particular section.

13 DR. CARPENTIER: The MATE data? Were you asking
14 about that one too? There's two appendices, A1, A1i that
15 talk about how we went through the MATE data. I think it
16 was for 2004/2008 and both sets for 4th grade and 8th grade
17 [inaudible] math. And we looked at the projections there
18 and talked to the MATE service center to try to figure out
19 what would be ambitious yet achievable. And the achievable
20 part was part of what we wanted to make sure we'd had
21 experience with goals that were just too hard to make.
22 Our state accountability system before PASS required a
23 tenth increase for school every year so that average
24 became 3.3 on a 5 point scale as the bottom instead of

1 3.0. So you had to be above average to be average in our
2 state. And we knew that having a goal like that that was
3 increasing every year --

4 REVIEWER 3: Wait, say that again. You had to
5 be above average to be average in your state?

6 DR. CARPENTIER: To be rated average in our
7 state, you had to be above average. You had to be at 3.3.
8 And it increased every year by another tenth. So we know
9 the impact on schools of having a goal that's not
10 achievable and we wanted to make very sure that what we
11 have here was ambitious but was still very achievable so
12 that we don't discourage our school district.

13 REVIEWER 4: Just to follow up on the data a
14 bit, I think you'll get to your presentation to work on
15 this, all 1251 pages. You laid out recent trends on
16 student achievement and graduation rates in South Carolina
17 and you noted, for instance, a pattern of often an initial
18 bump on a new assessment and then years of stabilizing.
19 That seems to be reflected like they did on state level
20 but [inaudible] data. What do you understand from that in
21 terms of policies and practices behind that pattern and
22 how have those lessons informed what you've put together
23 here?

24 DR. HARRISON: Well, basically we've learned

1 that we need to really focus on what happens in the
2 classroom. We've had the academic standards in place in
3 South Carolina for many years and we discovered that many
4 districts really just had the standards and they were
5 teaching students from the standards. They did not have
6 the capacity to develop curriculum documents that were
7 aligned to the standards. And that's the peak of what you
8 see is part of our S-cubed system, our Standard Support
9 System. We have for our state, developed curriculum
10 materials that are aligned to our state standards. That
11 is something that we will carry on as we have shifted to
12 PAT and as we moved our enhanced standards, the common
13 course standards, we will make sure that we have those
14 resources available for statewide use by schools.

15 In our curriculum piece we have alignment to
16 suggested resources or recommended resources, we have
17 suggested instructional strategies, we have assessment
18 strategies. And we're working on an assessment item bank
19 that would be aligned to the standards. We realized that
20 our teachers needed more tools as we shift so that we will
21 be able to maintain that bump and even surpass student
22 achievement as we move along.

23 An additional part of our S-cubed system that we
24 mention in the document is our professional development,

1 making sure that our professional development is ongoing
2 professional development, not one-shot professional
3 development. And we really initiated this past year a
4 regional delivery of services. And in that regional
5 delivery of services, we have been able to tailor our
6 professional development services that deal with - that we
7 focused on this year specifically, the curriculum
8 alignment pieces that we had developed, were able to
9 tailor those services to meet the needs of the district.
10 So therefore, districts that had curriculum documents, we
11 know that we had at least 32 districts that had their own
12 documents. And so the other 50-plus districts, we worked
13 on, making sure that they had teachers coming to the
14 sessions that we worked over a series of sessions, not
15 just on shot to say here is the document. But that they
16 returned in an ongoing way so that they would be able to
17 work with schools and districts.

18 DR. CARPENTIER: Another piece of this that
19 Valerie - in addition to what she's talked about on the S-
20 cubed is a model scope and sequence as well because we
21 found some teachers spending too much time on some
22 standards and not even getting to other ones. So this
23 will help the novice teacher. It will help teachers that
24 don't have other resources and we'll build on that with

1 the common [inaudible].

2 REVIEWER 1: Thank you. I think we've got a
3 good answer to that. Any other follow-up?

4 REVIEWER 4: The only follow-up would be so my
5 sense is that what I was hearing is a lesson learned in
6 terms of having set high expectations, the need to embed
7 further into classroom practice. What from your plan
8 would you site as evidence that would increase the
9 confidence of that plan?

10 DR. PODA: Well, I will take a stab at it. The
11 math and science scores we have seen more improvement than
12 in our reading scores. And we looked specifically at what
13 our math and science coaches were doing in the schools, in
14 the classrooms, and we have taken some of their strategies
15 and are working with our literacy team now to implement
16 some of the same things. And it's more one-on-one
17 instruction, coaching in classrooms. And we have seen
18 evidence that that has worked pretty significantly in some
19 cases. We rank number one in the country in improvement
20 in science, for example. So we do have that in place.

21 DR. CARPENTIER: And what Janice is talking
22 about, we had several different instructional coaching
23 models. We had a written first coach model, a literacy
24 model. We have some math and science. We've combined all

1 that. It's now into an instructional coaching model where
2 they're all using cognitive coaching to approach is based
3 on what --

4 REVIEWER 3: Is that the I-coaching initiative?

5 DR. CARPENTIER: That's the I-coach initiative
6 where we combined all of our coaches with a uniform,
7 cognitive coaching model to take from the lessons from the
8 math and science coaches.

9 DR. POSTLEWAIT: And very quickly I will say
10 from a policy perspective, is in fact in the
11 reauthorization of ESEA. We can move away from the grade
12 designation on the summit of tests and get more to a
13 DeGross model. The comprehensive data systems that are
14 represented here will allow us to see fairly quickly which
15 practices in the state are resulting in far greater than
16 average [inaudible] for the students who need to
17 accelerate their learning. Now we have this - we use this
18 language, but we don't actually have the systems in place
19 that would all us to track growth on progressions of
20 learning and then use what the data are telling us about
21 the pockets of success that exist so that we can use the
22 smart networks to both vertically within a district and
23 horizontally across - and hopefully across states - scale
24 what we know is working for a specific student when you're

1 able to measure the growth of individual students.

2 DR. HARRISON: I'm going to just follow up on
3 something, just add something that kind of gives us an
4 indication of what the students are doing and the support
5 we've had statewide. For forms of assessment, we've had
6 allocations to purchase forms of assessments that are
7 aligned to our state standards. We have three forms of
8 assessment pages that are identified for [inaudible] to
9 use and purchase and they have been doing that. We have
10 extensive use of NWEA's map program in over 80 districts
11 in our state. And those schools have been using the map
12 data to judge individual student growth and progress where
13 they had the goals, of course, set for student growth.
14 And also many of them were meeting their goals. So I just
15 wanted to add that because that also gives us a true
16 picture of the progress that students are making in
17 classrooms.

18 REVIEWER 1: Yes it is. It's a good transition.

19 REVIEWER 5: Yeah, because I think one of the
20 things that you've done well and I appreciated your
21 fractal that is a metaphor that speaks to me and probably
22 is a very apt metaphor for the comprehensiveness of your
23 sort of feedback system. And so I appreciate the
24 complexities you're dealing with. One of the aspects of

1 the complexities of your feedback system that includes
2 both curriculum and student performance and then your
3 slice, you longitudinal information system is how that
4 then coordinates also with our ADEP and PADEPP, the
5 systems that will feedback also into your accountability
6 system for teachers and principals. And again, I want to
7 say I appreciate that you really have communicated that
8 comprehensiveness and almost organic approach to that
9 feedback system. But I'm still a little unclear about how
10 the curriculum system and the student system and the long-
11 term system and then the teacher feedback and principal
12 feedback systems kind of go together.

13 DR. CARPENTIER: Right now they're separate.
14 The ADEP system - we have an ADEP data system. We have a
15 PADEPP data system, but they're separate and they're not
16 talking to each other, so part of what we have in our SLBS
17 grant and in this application is money to pull all that
18 together. So we've got that data and it goes into our
19 longitudinal data warehouse, but they're separate systems
20 right now. We're using the teacher certification number
21 for our highly qualified teacher Title 2 report, so we can
22 pull from the student information system and pull from
23 that and create reports out of that. But what we're
24 planning to do is tie that all together as part of one

1 system so we get the effectiveness ratings tied back to
2 teachers, tied back to colleges of ed and other prep
3 programs, tied back to programs that the student and the
4 teacher are engaged in.

5 REVIEWER 5: : How do you envision pulling that
6 back together?

7 DR. PODA: Well, we already do it through the
8 Teacher Advancement Program, the TAP schools. We have 43
9 of those and so we've already got a model that we're using
10 to tie them together. We actually look at the teacher
11 effectiveness in terms of the classroom observations and
12 they receive a score of 1 to 5 based on their overall
13 compilation of those observations that they have for a
14 year, and then we look at the student growth data. And
15 that's also rated on a 1 to 5 scale in terms of whether -
16 a 3 being a year's growth. Anything above that is more
17 than a year's growth. And so those teachers are then
18 awarded an incentive bonus if they score at least a 3 or
19 higher. And it increases depending on how much growth
20 they make. So we have that model already that we're able
21 to take the student achievement data and couple it with
22 the teacher data and then we can - we also have a system
23 already set up and we're already doing - providing that
24 feedback to the colleges of education so that they know

1 what their graduates are performing - how they're
2 performing in the classroom which we think is really a
3 key. It's not so much the qualifications they have but
4 what they actually do once they get in the classroom.

5 REVIEWER 5: And one more. Can you remind me on
6 the teacher effectiveness scores, what data you're using
7 on that?

8 DR. HARRISON: We're using MAT data for the
9 growth piece of that. And then we're also using the
10 [inaudible], the PAT and PAT assessment statewide data.

11 REVIEWER 5: Just from observation did you say?

12 DR. PODA: It's an observation and a dossier and
13 we will be adding - we'll be adding also the PB --

14 DR. CARPENTIER: Project Based Learning
15 Assessment.

16 DR. PODA: Right, right.

17 DR. CARPENTIER: Authentic assessment and a
18 portfolio for students.

19 DR. PODA: And it's similar - it's work sampling
20 is what it really is right now in terms of the teacher
21 taking samples of the student's work and analyzing that
22 and using it. We looked at - starting back at about 2004
23 - we started the shift to effectiveness. And we thought
24 we needed to put a bridge in there from going from only

1 looking at qualifications to the effectiveness, so right
2 now it's more of we measure the teacher's ability to
3 analyze data and use the data and now the next shift will
4 be to actually holding them accountable for the results of
5 their SKIV. So it was a shift because we found that our
6 teachers didn't have the depth of knowledge that they
7 needed to move immediately to those performance
8 [simultaneous conversation].

9 DR. REX: Could I add one thing - and this team
10 would be really disappointed if I didn't find a way to get
11 this in. One of the things I think we've learned a lot
12 about through the TAP schools but also through the lattice
13 program which is teaming and looping is that we think that
14 part of the answer lies in helping teachers function more
15 in teams, not just planning teams but actually, you know,
16 instructional teams. And we've seen that in the TAP
17 experience in terms of them seeing themselves as a group
18 working together, being rewarded together hopefully.
19 We've done really some fascinating work with teaming and
20 looping and we're seeing some amazing results in the
21 second year especially. We have teams of teachers take
22 responsibility for groups of kids and stay with them for
23 more than one academic year. So we're learning as we go,
24 but when we talked about integrating this system, we have

1 a lot of hands-on experience that we think even though
2 it's mostly intuitive right now is going to help us move
3 ahead pretty quickly.

4 DR. CARPENTIER: In terms of how we're going to
5 integrate those, that's goal C-2 in our application and
6 the timeline starts on page 89 and it's got the steps for
7 integrating those two data bases and there's some
8 additional detail in our budget.

9 REVIEWER 1: Thank you. And I apologize for
10 seeming to cut people off, but [simultaneous
11 conversation]. But these are segueing very nicely. I
12 don't know if we anticipated what you were going to say or
13 if you anticipated what we were going to ask, but it's
14 working out rather well. So [Reviewer 4] have one more
15 follow-up question that's going to lead us also into the
16 discussion of teachers and leaders in more depth.

17 REVIEWER 4: Thank you. I just wanted to follow
18 up on that question of the teacher effectiveness because
19 you expanded beyond obviously standardized test scores and
20 you have now some observational components [inaudible] and
21 a work sampling. Are there other factors you're
22 envisioning, (a) and (b) of that set, where do you think
23 you gain most information that's useful to you
24 operationally.

1 DR. HARRISON: Of that set, probably we gain
2 most from the formative assessment information, the
3 information that we get from student's progress, ongoing
4 progress during the school year and their growth peaks
5 because a student may not start on grade level. But if a
6 teacher is able to move that student and we're able to
7 have that growth peak as a component of that, that gives
8 substantial information about improving classroom practice
9 and then by improving the student learning and
10 achievement.

11 DR. CARPENTIER: And just to remind you, our
12 ESPA, some of the assessments have to test on grade level.
13 So if we've got a student who's below grade level, but the
14 sum of the tests isn't going to give you the right
15 information. It also doesn't give you the right
16 information about students who are advanced beyond the
17 grade level because of the No Child Left Behind
18 limitations.

19 DR. PODA: I think one of the most fascinating
20 things I've seen happen is that we have the teacher
21 observation data and the student achievement data and give
22 that 1 to 5 rating system and the TAP score and sometimes
23 we see the teacher get a 5 in observations and a 1 in
24 student achievement - not often, but sometimes we do. And

1 so we have now started analyzing why has a teacher been
2 rated so high but their students aren't achieving.
3 Sometimes we often see just the opposite. The students
4 are achieving, but the teacher is being rated low on their
5 observation. So we're beginning to analyze and go back
6 into those classrooms and really look to see what's
7 happening and whether or not we're getting a true picture
8 of the classroom. So I think it's both and it's the
9 combination of the two that's really informing our work.

10 REVIEWER 4: Thank you.

11 REVIEWER 1: And [Reviewer 2] is just - while
12 we're on this topic, we just thought we'd group the
13 questions even if they're in a different order on our
14 piece of paper. So go ahead, [Reviewer 2].

15 REVIEWER 2: We're very interested in your
16 project-based learning assessments, so if you could talk a
17 little bit more about the developments, the scoring,
18 recording the standardization of that that would be very
19 interesting.

20 DR. PODA : What we're trying to accomplish is
21 that since we don't have assessments for all teachers that
22 are standardized like the ones that are required for ESEA,
23 we wanted to include all teachers because that's one of
24 the things we heard loud and clear from teachers is that

1 they didn't want to leave out the art teachers or the PE
2 teachers. So we will be looking at developing assessments
3 that we can use for those groups of teachers in particular
4 and to be able to assess the work that they're doing so
5 that they can be part of this growth method. Sometimes
6 they also participate with other clusters, so in other
7 words if they're the art teacher, they may work with
8 several groups of other teachers like the 2nd, 3rd and 4th
9 grade and integrate the art work into the rest of the
10 curriculum, and that's the way that they can also have
11 authentic assessments of their work is to see how the
12 students do in terms of integrating it. So I think that
13 those are some of the ways that we plan to do it. We have
14 a history going back to the 80s where we had a teacher
15 incentive program that we started looking at ways that we
16 could measure and give bonuses to teachers based on their
17 performance and so we do have a history of working in that
18 area.

19 REVIEWER 1: Any follow up with that [REVIEWER
20 3]?

21 REVIEWER 3: I would say how to do you plan to
22 use the data from that? If you could be a little bit more
23 specific.

24 DR. PODA: Okay. So primarily it will be used

1 in place of the standardized test for those teachers that
2 don't have them. So that will be their student
3 achievement component of the effectiveness measure because
4 we don't have a standardized PE test, so we'll be using
5 those instead. So that's how it will be used.

6 REVIEWER 2: Another quick question. As far as
7 the development of these, are these developed by
8 individual teachers, groups of teachers, is it a
9 standardized thing across the state?

10 DR. PODA: It will be developed with teacher
11 input as well as expert input and so we'll have a
12 combination of both to help guide the teachers because I
13 think that that's where teachers will be looking for some
14 guidance and some help and for us to make sure that it's
15 reliable and valid, we'll also need some expert help with
16 that.

17 REVIEWER 1: Okay. And I think I'm going to ask
18 that [Reviewer] and [Reviewer] ask the questions that
19 you have while we're still on this topic about student
20 growth modeling, value-added, the whole value-added kind
21 of approach to teacher evaluation, any other finishing-up
22 questions about that.

23 REVIEWER 5: As you were talking about the
24 assessment models and the value-added models, a couple

1 questions on the value added. You've chosen and you
2 described sort of applying the UVA model. I guess I would
3 like to hear a little bit more about how you will be using
4 the value added model and then also will you be applying
5 it to alternatively certified teachers from, you know,
6 programs that are doing the alternative certifications and
7 just describe a little bit more on the value added if you
8 don't mind.

9 DR. PODA: We will be using it for all teachers
10 whether they've gone through an alternative - and we do
11 now the same thing with our TAP schools. We are looking
12 at the alternatively prepared teachers the same way we do
13 - as a matter of fact we've even done some studies on that
14 and we found that after three years in the classroom we
15 really can't tell the difference between those who went
16 through traditional programs and those who came through
17 the alternative programs. The other part of your question
18 - I'm sorry, if you'll repeat it. Just give me a hint.

19 REVIEWER 5: You're applying the UVA model and,
20 you know, it's interesting, there are sort of three
21 models, I guess, to over-generalize out there, of value-
22 added. So if you can talk a little bit more about why
23 that model and how specifically it's being implemented.

24 DR. PODA: Well, I think we probably are using

1 the Tennessee model - more of that than the UVA model, but
2 we are working with the SAS institute to be able to
3 generate our evaluated scores and they use a data base of
4 teachers and looking at data longitudinally of what an
5 expected growth would be for a student with the history of
6 the students in our schools. So I think that that also
7 gives some reassurance to teachers that they're not being
8 measured on whether they have all gifted children or all
9 the lowest children, but they're actually measured on the
10 growth that students make. We have some schools that have
11 historically been low-performing and now all of a sudden
12 they're realizing that they are actually out-performing.
13 And that's been a tremendous morale boost for those
14 teachers. They really see that they're making progress
15 and so that's the way we're using it.

16 REVIEWER 5: Can you point to me or maybe you
17 can't, but was that described in your project as far as
18 being able to do the expected growth model from --

19 DR. : I don't remember how much detail we put
20 in there, but Betsy?

21 DR. CARPENTIER: That section starts at 100.—I
22 just want to add that in addition to the TAP model, we've
23 also been using the National Dropout Prevention Center's
24 model out of Clemson for our nine-plus schools project

1 where we're looking at growth and effectiveness of
2 programs there too. So we're working on two different
3 models right now and as we get input from our
4 stakeholders, we're not quite sure what model we'll end up
5 with, but we've got experience with those two.

6 DR. HARRISON: I want to add one other thing,
7 too. Some districts in our state have teacher pay-for-
8 performance models and they're using virtual comparison
9 groups, the NWEA model for that where they have the
10 matched student of similar demographics for the schools.
11 And so that is being used in districts around our state as
12 well. Just wanted to mention that.

13 REVIEWER 5: What model was that?

14 DR. HARRISON: It's virtual comparison group
15 model. And basically it's a model - really you get a
16 report on the different schools in the district and not
17 student for student comparison, it's always a virtual
18 comparison group. And what they do is indicate how
19 certain schools with certain demographics are performing
20 on the map of assessment. And they are - in fact,
21 Charleston County School District uses that to give their
22 teachers awards for student growth and pay-for-
23 performance. So that's sort of a hybrid version, but
24 that's being used. And the good reason because so many

1 districts in our state are using NWEA maps as a formative
2 assessment. And also that is a factor that's included
3 with the TAP model as well. So I did want to mention that
4 to you.

5 DR. CARPENTIER: If you will look on pages 105
6 and 106, I think that's where you will find how we are
7 using the value-added scores and the authentic assessments
8 as well as the value-added.

9 REVIEWER 5: Thank you.

10 REVIEWER 4: Just a quick follow-up if I could
11 on the value-added. Since you've already had some
12 experience with it, experimenting with it in Tampa and a
13 few other places, as you know they rely on - one of the
14 underlying factors is the ability to compare year to year
15 and that there is the presumption at least of some
16 underlying scale that allows you to compare the 10th
17 graders and 6th graders and 7th graders on something as well
18 as account for factors beyond the teacher such as the
19 tendency to have non-random assignment of students to
20 various classrooms within the schools and so forth. Given
21 your experience, how do you understand those factors in
22 your own thinking about value-added? How do you manage
23 those kinds of issues or thinking about them?

24 DR. PODA: One of the reasons why we developed a

1 new test because we didn't have vertical alignment within
2 the PAC test and so one of the criteria when we revamped
3 the testing system and went to the Palmetto Achievement
4 Challenge Test or the PASS test from the - that to PASS
5 then we put in a vertical scale so that we could look from
6 4th grade to 5th grade, and 5th grade to 6th grade and see
7 what that kind of growth was and it didn't depend on what
8 kids were in the classroom. You would be able to measure
9 them longitudinally based on their performance and not
10 just on all what all 5th graders do, and then what they do
11 in the 6th grade. So we were looking at individual
12 students grades.

13 REVIEWER 1: Okay. Well we have been sort of
14 working our way through the whole data and assessment and
15 evaluation business, but let's go back for a few minutes
16 to the teachers themselves, principals and we'll ask a
17 couple questions about that. So I'll start with [Reviewer
18 2].

19 REVIEWER 2: Okay. If you could expand a little
20 bit on first your philosophy for alternative certification
21 programs and then your process for approving those
22 programs. I'll list all of the questions now because
23 we're basically going [inaudible] group connected. How
24 are the programs monitored and what things do you have in

1 place for holding all the - alt cert programs accountable?

2 DR. PODA: We have had a history of alternative
3 certification since 1984. As a matter of fact, Dr. Rex
4 started the first alternative certification program in the
5 state at Winthrop University.

6 DR. REX: I was 18 at the time.

7 DR. PODA: [laughter] So our philosophy is that
8 we have shortage areas in the state historically and they
9 have been special education and math and science and the
10 other subjects vary from year to year, but they're pretty
11 consistent, and that we wanted a way to bring in other
12 people to the profession through alternative routes and
13 especially those that already had the content knowledge.
14 We have limited our alt certification program to only
15 middle school and high school. We don't use alt cert for
16 elementary or early childhood or for special education
17 with the exception of behavior disorders. And we look for
18 majors that are close or equivalent to the subjects that
19 they'll be teaching. So that's been our philosophy. We
20 also required subject matter content test from the very
21 beginning of the program and that was the way that we
22 could ensure that they had the content and then our
23 training program focuses on the pedagogy, and on
24 strategies for classroom management and all the different

1 things about almost survival for beginning teachers. And
2 that has worked well for us. Now, how do we approve the
3 programs? We run the only program in the state through
4 the State Department of Education. We used to have it
5 based at colleges and we decided we needed more
6 uniformity, so that no matter where in the state you were
7 enrolled in the program that you would be getting the same
8 content. So we developed a curriculum for that based on
9 what we got feedback about what first-year teachers needed
10 to know and it was based on the in-test standards
11 primarily. And then we also have a continuous assessment
12 program built into the alternative certification program
13 so at any point in time, we can ask a person to leave the
14 program. So there are benchmarks. When they reach that,
15 then they may exit from the program. They also have to be
16 employed by a district before they can enter the program.
17 So we don't just put thousands of people through the
18 program that aren't employed. So we use our resources for
19 that. And so we monitor the program by looking at the
20 results. And what I mean by that is how well they do on
21 the Praxis exams, both the PLT and the content area. And
22 we have found they do extremely well in the PLT because we
23 have really tailored our training program to those
24 standards. And then - and the content, too - but also the

1 ADEP performance in the classroom. And they cannot
2 progress to a professional certification until they have
3 performed in the classroom to our satisfaction. So that's
4 part of our tiered certification system.

5 REVIEWER 1: Thank you. And let's move on to
6 [Reviewer 3].

7 REVIEWER 3: A couple of real quick follow-ups
8 to that last point. So you do this out of the department.
9 Do they have to be certified through a university?

10 DR. PODA: No. They are certified through the
11 Department of Education.

12 REVIEWER 3: And it's only for middle and high
13 school.

14 DR. PODA: That's correct.

15 REVIEWER 3: Do you have any thoughts about
16 expanding it to elementary?

17 DR. PODA: We have thought about it. Our
18 concern is reading and the teaching of reading and that we
19 think that there has to be a good bit of training in that
20 area. But we are considering other ways of expanding the
21 program.

22 REVIEWER 3: Last quick question. How many
23 people a year are in this program?

24 DR. PODA : Over a three year period we have

1 about 1100 to 1200 at any one time.

2 REVIEWER 3: That's very good.

3 DR. PODA : It's the largest producer of
4 teachers - single producer of teachers in the state.

5 REVIEWER 3: Did you describe that in your
6 proposal?

7 DR. PODA: Yes, we did.

8 REVIEWER 3: Great. Good. My question, real
9 question. In your discussion of great teachers and
10 leaders, your answers seemed to focus primarily on teacher
11 effectiveness and less on leader effectiveness. Please
12 explain in greater clarity, South Carolina's plan for
13 effective leadership from preparation to recruitment and
14 retention.

15 DR. PODA: Okay. Well, I think the reason that
16 you'd see that is because we have more experience with
17 teacher effectiveness than we do principal effectiveness.
18 We've just gotten into that with a Teacher Incentive Fund
19 Grant that we received a couple years ago where we're
20 beginning now to measure and give bonuses to the
21 principals the TAP schools for the student performance.
22 So our plan is to (1) implement a tiered certification
23 system for principals so that they will also have a - for
24 the lack of a better word, a probationary period or a

1 period where before we give them a professional
2 certification as a principal that they'll have a temporary
3 in that area. And then once they have shown that they can
4 be a good leader, an effective leader and that the student
5 performance in the school where they are working is also
6 improving, then they will be given a professional
7 certificate. So it will be based on performance as a
8 principal on an evaluation system. That's the PADEPP, and
9 then the student performance. And it's an aggregate of
10 all the performance measures they have in that school -
11 and graduation rates for the high school.

12 REVIEWER 3: What about retention?

13 DR. PODA: Retention of teachers? Of
14 principals?

15 REVIEWER 3: Of principals in many isolated
16 settings and that kind of thing.

17 DR. PODA : Right. That's a challenge for us.
18 We see in our lowest-performing schools that the retention
19 of teachers and principals is a challenge.

20 DR. CARPENTIER: And superintendents.

21 DR. PODA: And superintendents. Yes. And so we
22 are - you know, one of the things we are trying to do is
23 provide some stability or create stability in those
24 schools and to try to retain our most effective teachers

1 and principals in those schools where we need them the
2 most. And one way we'll do that is with bonuses and also
3 we're looking at other changes to the compensation system
4 that we'll reward people for working in those areas and
5 that's part of the plan that we have for revamping our
6 compensation system.

7 DR. CARPENTIER: We're also looking at expanding
8 our teacher housing and educator housing project because a
9 lot of the challenge is is once we get people who are
10 willing to go to some of these remote areas, there's not
11 adequate housing that you would want to live in.

12 REVIEWER 3: Would that apply to principals?

13 DR. CARPENTIER: For educators, yes.

14 REVIEWER 4: I just want to follow up on that
15 because one of the task force, I think, you mentioned that
16 - the 2008 task force mentioned also the concern the - I
17 believe the term was "incessant crying" about working
18 conditions for teachers and the role that that plays
19 within that. Like piggyback with that, the Riley
20 Institute Report talked about the relation of school and
21 community and the relation - and sort of mapping that back
22 to what comes up here as well in terms of the sense of
23 isolation in some of these schools and communities. How
24 do you understand that? How does that fit in to what

1 you're trying to - how you're addressing that here in this
2 plan?

3 DR. PODA: We do an annual survey of all the
4 teachers, students and parents as part of our
5 accountability system and we have added about four years
6 ago a section on working conditions for teachers. So we
7 now have about four years worth of data. As a matter of
8 fact we cancelled a meeting yesterday where we were
9 supposed to get feedback on the latest information on the
10 working conditions and rescheduled that for next week.
11 And we are looking at it because one of the things we're
12 finding is that in our lowest-performing schools overall,
13 and this is a generalization, but the teachers don't feel
14 safe. And so if they don't feel safe, they probably
15 aren't going to be as effective. And so we're looking at
16 all those components about working conditions. And part
17 of the way we're trying to address it is as Dr. Rex said
18 the "whole teacher" - is to look at those other criteria
19 of feeling safe, being in a clean environment, having the
20 resources that they need, having adequate housing. I used
21 to be in charge of our Center for Teacher Recruitment in
22 South Carolina, and I used to say the hardest place to
23 recruit teachers for is the ones that are more than 50
24 miles from a Walmart. And you see that they don't have

1 those quality of life factors. And so we're trying to
2 address some of them as we can through housing and other
3 activities for teachers, and the social networking,
4 scteachervillage.com is the way that we're trying to get
5 teachers connected so that they can be able to have
6 conversations with other teachers and not feel so
7 isolated. So that's one way we're trying to [inaudible].

8 DR. REX: Let me add one thing, too. It kind of
9 goes back to the leadership question. And that is these
10 locally elected school boards. This is something that's
11 left out of the discussion all too often, I think, when we
12 talk about improving and reforming education. In our
13 state and I'm sure this is true in other states depending
14 on the outcome of the most recent election, we always have
15 some local school boards that are really a part of the
16 problem, not a part of the solution. And I mentioned to
17 you earlier, the Palmetto Priority Schools that, you know,
18 one of the unique features, I think, of that effort is
19 that we've insisted that the chair of that school board
20 participate in these regularly scheduled meetings with
21 superintendent, state superintendent and others. And
22 we're also looking at the need for some legislation that
23 would mandate a certain amount of training that would take
24 place during the first term that someone is elected to a

1 local school board and they could not run again. That
2 would be an incumbency requirement until they
3 satisfactorily complete that training. So we certainly
4 haven't figured it out but we think it's a significant
5 component that is being overlooked by many of us as we
6 think about transforming education.

7 REVIEWER 1: Thank you. We've only got probably
8 two more questions and we've got 14 minutes. So that's
9 the good news. I'm going to ask one and then we're going
10 to wrap up with a question, kind of a more general
11 question. Okay, you have basically outlined a regional
12 delivery system that's going to support a lot of your RTT
13 efforts - the smart centers. And it's a very impressive
14 array of activities and requirements and responsibilities
15 placed on those smart centers. So could you talk to us a
16 little bit about how the centers will be staffed,
17 supported and sustained to be able to deliver all of the
18 work that they're being asked to do?

19 DR. HARRISON: Well, currently, we are operating
20 smart centers. We have right now before the expansion
21 that you see in the proposal, we have smart centers that
22 work with science, math and literacy. We started the
23 smart centers really as regional education units that
24 worked with math and science. And they're supervised

1 right now by coordinators at each of the sites who have
2 eight of those. And that framework is already set up. So
3 this expansion is being built on that. We've seen lots of
4 success with the math and science hubs we used to call
5 them, then regional centers and now we're calling them
6 smart centers. And we've seen success with the schools
7 and students that they've worked with, improvement in
8 algebra scores and of course our steady improvement in our
9 math and science scores nationally. And so we're excited
10 about the accomplishments there and so that framework has
11 been very helpful because it has enabled us to target our
12 services to the different regions of the state and better
13 meet the needs of the students and teachers in those
14 areas. Now the expanded version of the - that was the
15 basis for it and the success that we're having and Betsy
16 will - I'll let her explain the expansion that that's the
17 basis for.

18 DR. CARPENTIER: The foundation.

19 DR. HARRISON: The foundation.

20 DR. CARPENTIER: So what we're planning to have
21 is directors or project leaders within these centers who
22 will coordinate the services that are required by the
23 district in those regions and then the turnaround managers
24 will be working out of there and working with the

1 turnaround schools projects, the data coaches who will be
2 working on the seven A's presentation and how to use data,
3 will be working out of the centers for the districts and
4 reporting back to the chief information officer. Thei-
5 coaches which are already in the districts and the ones
6 that we have for coaching teachers and principals on how
7 to do evaluations will be working there and reporting back
8 to the Division of Educator Quality and Leadership.

9 REVIEWER 1: Where are you going to find these
10 people?

11 DR. CARPENTIER: Actually that's not a problem
12 in our state right now because of the high unemployment.

13 REVIEWER 1: So among the educator workforce?

14 DR. CARPENTIER: Yeah. I think if you look at
15 our stabilization application, you'll see we've lost about
16 1400 teachers over the last years, so we've got a pool,
17 probably for the first time in a long time, of qualified
18 folks for that. So ultimately that's going to report up
19 through the new division with the new deputy. But it's
20 also going to be part of our cross-divisional team efforts
21 which we've had a lot of success with.

22 DR. PODA: And may I also just say that those
23 employees will also work together to analyze the data and
24 then share that with the struggling schools so that's

1 another role that they'll play in helping them write their
2 school improvement report.

3 REVIEWER 4: One of the things I just want to
4 understand, too, the relation to the smart centers to
5 something you mentioned elsewhere in here about ambitions
6 for tying in non-school factors that underlie student
7 performance. How do you understand the relationship with
8 the smart centers or is there some other entity that's the
9 linkage for school and non-school agencies?

10 DR. CARPENTIER: Well, we've got that integrated
11 state database already. And so any policymaker or
12 researcher now can ask for research that would tie, for
13 example, PAT scores to whether or not the children's
14 parents were in an emergency room over the weekend before
15 the test happened. I mean, that's the kind of detail you
16 can get down to with the identified data for that.

17 REVIEWER 4: How does that look operationally?

18 DR. REX: That is going to be a new level of
19 discourse in our state - this data system and what comes
20 out of it. I think Dr. Postlewait in terms of the State
21 Board is going to have to help drive that discussion in
22 terms of the relationships that we think we will find that
23 exist there. Frankly, we haven't had that level of
24 sophistication. We haven't had that level of discussion.

1 There will probably be lots of policy makers and policy
2 maker groups that will have to drive that discussion and I
3 think the State Board will be one of them.

4 DR. CARPENTIER: But one of the interfaces we
5 plan to build that's in our application in Section C is
6 the research or policy maker interface for accessing all
7 of the data.

8 REVIEWER 2: All right. I have I think probably
9 what will be the final question, and it's a provocative
10 question. The question is why should South Carolina be
11 selected for funding? And some of the points you might
12 want to cover in addition to others are impact on
13 educational form, benefits for students, benefits for the
14 state and sustainability after the grant is over.

15 REVIEWER 1: Do you want her to read the list
16 again? [laughter]

17 DR. REX: Well, I can tell you are all very
18 proud of that provocative question. [laughter] Reading
19 your non-verbal. That is a great question, and I'll just
20 start out. It's not too different, I think, my response
21 from what I said in the introductory remarks. We know in
22 a way what's happening here is the nation is going to
23 place some bets, some high stake bets on some states that
24 can lead the way and hopefully come up with some new

1 answers that are replicable, that can be brought up to
2 scale. I think South Carolina is a good bet. I used to
3 be high school football coach and an English teacher many
4 years ago, so excuse this metaphor, but I think of us as a
5 walk-on. As you know, we're not heavily sponsored or
6 recruited and I hope you see that we wrote this proposal.
7 Nobody else did. This is our proposal. We own it. We
8 believe in it. And we can do it. And I think we've
9 demonstrated we can do it. So if you're looking for some
10 horses to place a bet on from the national perspective as
11 well as obviously it would benefit our state, but from the
12 national perspective, I hope you'll really take a hard
13 look at us. I really think we can deliver.

14 DR. CARPENTIER: I started out with together we
15 are. We're building momentum on the systems that are
16 already in place. We started our accountability system in
17 our state in 1998? Yeah. So we've got over 10 years
18 experience of doing this. South Carolina is already on
19 this reform path and we can just build on that momentum
20 with this money and get it faster, better done deeper and
21 broader with all of the LEAs that we have signed up and
22 the uniform systems that we have. And then I've got some
23 information slides on sustainability and scale-up because
24 we're planning to use this money not to hire a whole bunch

1 of staff, but to hire people to implement and to build the
2 systems and the infrastructure that will be there after
3 we're done with the four years of the grant to build the
4 local capacity so that that can become an engine that
5 builds momentum and keeps going, build the regional
6 delivery systems so that can be another engine that keeps
7 it going and to build the modules of professional
8 development that we'll have recorded and available once
9 the grant is over. And we're also looking with some
10 stakeholders on how to repurpose our current funding for
11 example and our salary schedule and other funding that
12 we've got in K-12 education. We mention, I think,
13 somewhere in here, our funding taskforces that are already
14 looking at ways to re-fund - not refund but to change the
15 funding for public education. So this is something - the
16 state's already been down this path and we've got the
17 momentum going and we're planning to use this money to
18 build systems and infrastructure that will help us once
19 the grant's over.

20 DR. PODA: I'm going to address the point you
21 made about students because I think that really is what
22 has motivated us to do this. Our students want to learn
23 and they want to be read for the future and they want to
24 have the skills that are going to make them competitive

1 and a way to be a productive citizen in whatever South
2 Carolina becomes in the future. And I think that that's
3 what we want out of this is we want to be able to
4 transform our education system so that every child is
5 getting the kind of education that they need for the 21st
6 century, and for that next, you know, challenge that
7 they'll face when it comes down the road. I had a 7th
8 grader tell me one time that what he had gotten out of a
9 program that I had sponsored was that it had given him
10 hope for the future and a pathway to get there. And I
11 think that's what we want for all kids is to give them
12 hope that there's a great future ahead and then provide
13 them the tools and the pathway on how to get there.

14 DR. CARPENTIER: And this IGP that I flash back
15 up here is part of our whole personal pathway focus under
16 the Education Economic Development Act that's already
17 underway in South Carolina where they select a major
18 starting in high school. But in 8th grade, they start with
19 IGP, so we're tracking students to make sure that they're
20 going to be on time for graduation and have their 24
21 credits, have their major - but are not just focused on
22 getting their diploma, they're focused on higher ed and
23 their career.

24 REVIEWER 4: If I'm a teacher or a principal

1 somewhere else in the country and I'm thinking of changing
2 where I am, why should I come to South Carolina?

3 DR. PODA: Because when you become the South
4 Carolina Teacher of the Year you get a BMW to drive and a
5 \$25,000 bonus. [laughter]

6 REVIEWER 4: I'll leave you my card. [laughter]

7 DR. REX: Well, I think one of the reasons is if
8 you're a superstar, if you're willing to go to a
9 challenged school and if you're willing to help kids beat
10 expectations, especially in these challenged schools, we
11 have a compensation and reward program that will
12 acknowledge that and respond to it. You know, I think one
13 of the difficult things we have as a profession right now
14 if you go to a college or university and talk to a 19-
15 year-old about teaching, they say, well, you know, I have
16 to put in how many years? 20 years to work my way up
17 through a salary schedule? In South Carolina what we're
18 saying in this proposal is if you come to our state, if
19 you can demonstrate that you're outstanding in what you do
20 in a challenged environment, you can make six figures in
21 your first ten years. That's why you ought to come to
22 South Carolina.

23 REVIEWER 1: Valerie.

24 DR. HARRISON: Yeah. I just want to add to that

1 something that is near and dear to my heart and you'll be
2 able to tell that. But South Carolina is a place as you
3 see in this proposal where we have strategically outlined
4 a comprehensive system of support for teachers, for
5 students, for people in our community who really, really
6 want to see the preparation of our students as 21st century
7 leaders. In South Carolina we are embracing enhanced
8 standard systems. We are working to make sure the tools
9 are in place for teachers and that opportunities are there
10 and that we have the classrooms for students so that
11 they'll be able to maximize the knowledge and skills
12 necessary for 21st century learning.

13 So South Carolina, I think one more thing I need
14 to say, too. We'll have a system of assessment that will
15 enable students to demonstrate their abilities by looking
16 of course at the formative assessment piece, the summative
17 assessment piece and then the authentic assessment piece
18 is for students as well. So it's a place where as you can
19 see in this proposal, we have comprehensive - a
20 comprehensive system where we use data to inform
21 instruction and prepare our students for future
22 [inaudible].

23 REVIEWER 1: Can we have the last word from
24 Gerrita because we have 1:19 left.

1 DR. POSTELWAIT: I think South Carolina is a
2 microcosm of the country in many ways. We have many poor,
3 rural districts, very isolated, historically underserved
4 and under-participatory in the opportunities and blessings
5 of this country. We have urban centers and we have two of
6 the largest tourist centers in the country in Greenville
7 and Charleston. There is some of everything. It's a
8 politically difficult state in which to work. You've
9 referred to that. In fact, it's not a secret, but I think
10 it's politically difficult everywhere that I've worked
11 when the challenge of the new confronts the traditions of
12 the old. Michael Toffler began one of his books with this
13 line, "A new day is dawning and blind men everywhere are
14 rushing to push it back." In South Carolina, we've had to
15 confront the brutal reality of this new day at least a
16 decade or more ago and so in confronting the brutal
17 reality we are united in our determination to re-craft a
18 system that will serve our children and serve our
19 citizenry. And I think in that regard, we are a fractal
20 for the country.

21 REVIEWER 2: Thank you.

22 REVIEWER 3: That's very good.

23 REVIEWER 1: Thank you very much.

24 DR. REX: Thank you.

1 DR. CARPENTIER: Thank you for serving. I know
2 you had a lot of reading to do. [laughter]

3 REVIEWER 1: And you helped us with that.

4 DR. REX: Did you have any idea what you were
5 getting into when you [inaudible]. [laughter] I'll be you
6 didn't.

7 [End of proceedings as recorded.]