

### AGENDA

SC Education Oversight Full Committee Meeting

PO Box 11867 | 227 Blatt Building Columbia SC 29211 | WWW.SCEOC.ORG

Monday, October 14, 2024 1:00 p.m. Room 433, Blatt Building Ι. Welcome and Introductions ......April Allen Approval of Full Committee Minutes Ш. for June 10, 2024.....April Allen Ш. Special Presentation: Presentation from 2024 Elementary School Data Trailblazer Award Winner Arneice Renwick, Principal, Joanna-Woodson Elementary (Laurens 56) IV. Information Item: 2024 School Report Card Release...Dana Yow & Dr. Matthew Lavery Brian Newsome V. A Sad Sombic Stramittard StepAsstessments Subcommittee ......Dr. Patty Tate **Terry Alexander** Action Item: Cut Score Concordance of College Melanie Barton Russell Baxley Readiness Exams......Dr. Matthew Lavery VI. EIA Subcommittee Report EIA Subcommittee Update ...... Dr. Bob Couch Barbara B. Hairfield Kevin L. Johnson Information Item: Sidney Locke 2024-25 Budget Update.....Dr. Rainey Knight **Dwight Loftis** Jeri McCumbee Melissa Pender VII. Executive Session: Legal Matter Patty J. Tate C. Ross Turner, III Ellen Weaver VIII. Return to Open Session

IX. Adjournment Dana Yow EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

April Allen CHAIR

VICE CHAIR

Neal Collins **Bob Couch** 

Bill Hager

### SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE Full Committee Meeting Minutes of the Meeting June 10, 2024

**Members Present (in-person or remote):** April Allen, Melanie Barton, Russell Baxley, Dr. Bob Couch, Rep. Bill Hager, Barbara Hairfield, Sen. Kevin Johnson, Sen. Dwight Loftis, Jeri McCumbee, Melissa Pender, Sen. Ross Turner

**EOC Staff Present:** Tenell Felder, Gabrielle Fulton, Hope Johnson-Jones, Dr. Rainey Knight, Dr. Matthew Lavery, Dr. Jenny May, Dana Yow

**Guest(s) Present:** Dr. Matthew Ferguson, SCDE; Sally Cauthen, Consultant; Dr. Sara Jane Arnett, Consultant

EOC Executive Director Dana Yow opened the meeting and welcomed EOC committee member Jeri McCumbee as the new business appointee of Senator Greg Hembree.

Ms. Yow then asked for a motion to approve the April 8 full committee minutes. After the minutes were approved, Academic Standards and Assessments (ASA) subcommittee Vice Chair Barbara Hairfield was asked to give a report of the May 20<sup>th</sup> ASA subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Hairfield reported the ASA subcommittee received one information item from EOC Deputy Director Dr. Matthew Lavery on the cut score concordance of college readiness exams – specifically for the ACT and SAT. The subcommittee has received data on this topic and had discussions for several months with the goal of finding an equivalent score for both tests.

The subcommittee did not act on this item and expect to receive it as an action item in September.

Next, Ms. Hairfield reported that the ASA subcommittee approved the 2023 Report on the Educational Performance of Military Connected Students. The report found that military connected students outperformed their peers on all measures of academics.

Citing an increase in students having one parent die as a result of military service, one report recommendation was to monitor military connected students who have experienced loss or trauma and work with school-based liaisons with specialized training to both identify and effectively support these students.

Ms. Hairfield stated the report also indicated a lack of military student identifier collection protocol at the national level. As a result, states have difficulty in accurately capturing data on military connected students. It was recommended processes be put in place to accurately identify military connected students, and that if not implemented, the reporting accuracy would continue to have challenges. Recommendations for this include working to incentivize school reporting for military connected students within school district information systems.

Also included in the report was a recommendation to include military connected students as a filter on the SC Education Data Dashboard which would give the public access to the data. By surfacing this data publicly, districts that currently do not report will be incentivized to change data collection practices to improve data collection and quality.

Ms. Hairfield concluded her report and asked for a motion from the committee to approve the 2023 Report on the Educational Performance of Military Connected Students.

The motion carried as all were in favor.

Ms. April Allen then invited Dr. Bob Couch, chairman of the Education Improvement Act committee, to share the committee's report.

Dr. Couch stated he would share with the committee the findings and recommendations presented of the Teacher Loan Program (TLP) report. He stated he would be reporting on the governance of the program, funding, data collection and quality, and on the teacher pipeline.

Dr. Couch informed the committee that the EIA subcommittee met on May 20<sup>th</sup> and received an EIA budget update from Dr. Knight. He stated that at the retreat the committee should have the final information for the 2024-25 budget.

The 2024 TLP report was presented to the EIA subcommittee by Sally Cauthen ,Consultant to the EOC.

The following points were presented in the governance findings:

- The TLP statue did not provide governance structure conducive to a single entity to have the authority to manage the program including to take the actions for the TLP recommendations.
- Funding for all loan types have remained at the same level for 10 years or more.
- Balance in the revolving loan fund has more than doubled. This was suggestive of the programs perceived value to program participants.

The following point was presented in the data collection and reporting findings:

• The reporting process is labor intensive and paper driven, including self-reported data for some of the more significant data points.

The following points were presented in the Teacher Pipeline findings:

- The percentage of Alternative Certification programs and international teacher hires are the only categories of teacher hires that have increased over the past year.
- Program goals for African American and Male TLP applicants and recipients are not being met even though the respective thresholds are low.
- After two years of noticeable decline the number of students enrolled in bachelor and masters level education preparation programs for public and private institutions declined only slightly
- Clemson and USC have 1/3 of the overall enrollment of education prep programs. Clemson shows a 56.7% bachelor's enrollment increase since 2014, USC-Columbia a 28% decrease (but a slight uptick the last two years).
- Teacher cadets continue to be a significant source of TLP recipients.

Dr. Couch then presented the EIA subcommittee recommendations which included the following:

- The Teacher Loan Advisory Committee (TLAC) be directed to perform a critical review of the TLP report and submit to the EOC viable recommendations.
- A single entity be designated to direct the program and implement changes.

- The review of core program components for all three loan types, statutes, provisos and regulations governance approach, goals, loans and loan structure amounts.
- Establish clearly defined and targeted goals with measurable outcomes.

He then presented other recommendations that included consolidating type 2 and 3 funding with type 1 funding, streamlining and modernizing the TLP application process, and emphasizing methods to increase efforts for each component of the teacher pipeline and establish goals and expectations for each. Dr. Couch bought the recommendations for approval to the committee, after which Ms. Allen asked if there were any questions or comments.

Melanie Barton commented that the education field is facing multiple issues, citing nationwide teaching shortages. She suggested using the \$21 million revolving loan funds to incentivize more people to consider teaching, especially in rural communities. Barton also stated that a major problem is that no one entity is responsible for the TLP.

Senator Kevin Johnson asked how schools fund positions before ESSER funds. He noted he would need to be able to explain that to constituents.

Ferguson responded that it was not currently known how many teachers would be affected by the withdrawal of ESSER funds, but that a lot of the positions were created as new positions with ESSER funding.

Senator Dwight Loftis then asked how many of those positions were teaching positions.

Ferguson responded that it depended on how the district allocated their resources, but that many of those positions were coaches and interventionists.

In summary, Ms. Yow stated that the biggest recommendation to come out of the report is the EOC asking the TLAC to provide a report to the EOC on the Teacher Loan Program. She also suggested that the \$21 million in the RLF could be used to innovatively market the program or to market the teaching profession.

Allen asked if there were any other questions. As there were none, she asked for a motion to accept the report and recommendations from the EIA subcommittee.

The motion carried.

Next Dr. Jenny May and Dr. Rainey Knight were called forward to present the findings of the EOC's Beating the Odds Investigative Study (BTOIS).

Dr. Knight the presented the questions that drove data collection for BTOIS and explained the different phases of the study. The study will be carried out in two phases – the exploration phase and the confirmation phase. Each phase will be repeated at the middle and high school levels.

Dr. Knight shared that the partner schools selected to take part in the study had to meet the following criteria:

- Enrollment of more than 100 students.
- "Excellent" overall rating with no "Below Average" or "Unsatisfactory" indicator ratings.
- Poverty ratio greater than or equal to 77.6% based on average poverty index of elementary schools with an overall rating of "Below Average."
- Open enrollment policies that do not permit admission based on application or criteria.

The partner schools for the elementary level were as follows: Cleveland Elementary School, Spartanburg 7 School District; Monaview Elementary School, Greenville School District; Latta Elementary School, Dillon 3 School District; Kelly Edwards Elementary School, Barnwell 29 School District; Mathews Elementary School, Greenwood 50 School District; Merrywood Elementary School, Greenwood 50 School District and Waterloo Elementary School, Laurens 55 School District.

Dr. Knight then referred to the BTOIS graphic which outlined themes that EOC staff observed at the partner schools. We talked about our interviews and the themes that emerged.

The themes included High Expectations (There is a solution-oriented focus present at the school. Principal, teachers, student, and community consistently hold belief in students and adults.); Strong Leadership (There is a strong principal present and a supportive superintendent.); School culture (Family environment. Coaching up through individualized professional development. Coaching out is an option when needed. Teachers feel empowered and their voices heard); Community culture (There is a strength-based perspective and strong communication); Effective Teachers-Strong Tier 1 Instruction (Classroom teachers deliver high quality instruction with high quality resources), and Consistent Use of Data (Data usage is visible in the school. Data drives instruction with sense of urgency).

Next, Dr. Knight stated that students holding high expectations believed they could do the work and that teachers had empowered their students to be able to do the work. The high expectations adults held meant that they did not see poverty as a factor in whether or not a child would be able to succeed. Teachers also provided "bell to bell" instruction with a "laser like" focus on instruction.

Dr. Knight then introduced the next theme: a strong school leadership team. This team consists of the instructional leadership team, strong principal and a supportive superintendent. She stated that of the leadership team, a strong principal was the most crucial aspect. Characteristics of strong principal observed during the study are as following: visibility in school and in the community, clear communication, approachable, supportive of staff, ability to use data for student success and have the ability to "coach up or coach out."

Dr. Knight also noted that teachers expressed trust and respect for their leadership.

In conclusion for her section, Dr. Knight spoke of the superintendent's role to support the principal, be knowledgeable of what is happening at the school, and to set reasonable high expectations. She also stressed the importance of the superintendent being seen in the community.

Next, Dr. May discussed the findings in school culture from the Beating the Odds Investigative Study. The study found that the culture at the partner schools reflected the following characteristics: strong relationships and authentic care for the community, teachers feeling heard and valued by school administration, professional development for staff is individualized and incorporated through "coaching up," and celebration for success is balanced with consequences.

Dr. May then showed photos from schools visited during the study that showcased what school culture looked like in BTOIS partner schools. In one photo, Dr. May pointed out that school character posters were in English and Spanish which reflected the school culture valuing the community culture. In another photo, Dr. May showed how school signage was used to create a common culture in the school.

Next, Dr. May discussed the importance of BTOIS partner schools also having a strong community culture. She defined this as having strong relationships and utilization of all available resources in the community. She also defined it as the school valuing its community and not supplanting values and the existing culture. For specific examples of community culture, Dr. May showed photos from a community reading night she attended where books were supplied in English and Spanish for students. She also referred to a school that partnered with a local church to fund a math lab for students.

The next theme discussed was effective teachers and strong Tier 1 instruction for which teachers deliver high quality instruction with high quality resources. Other characteristic of this theme included preserved instructional time and longitudinal grade level planning.

Consistent use of data was the next theme observed at BTOIS partner schools. Dr. May stated that schools needed to monitor and know where their student are and to monitor progress. She recalled that in BTOIS partner schools, the following characteristics were observed: visible data usage, evidence of routine data meetings and progress monitoring, data-driven instruction, and a value and use of the accountability system for continuous quality improvement.

Dr. May referred to a specific principal who used data to also monitor students' patterns such as being picked up late or requests for additional food.

Following this Dr. May discussed the next steps of the BTOIS which includes a confirmatory analysis with additional qualifying BTOIS schools and an upcoming exploratory analysis for high schools and middle schools.

Questions and comments were then accepted.

Ms. Barton commented that the themes presented in the study were indicative of a wellfunctioning organization that knows their objective, problem solves, communicates and is data driven and asked the committee to consider how to duplicate its measures. She stated concern over keeping it going because of burn out that school principals experience. She also stated the need for principals and schools to be recognized for the hard work that they do.

Dr. Knight shared that the results of the study would be shared at SCASA by Drs. May and Lavery. She also stressed teachers using their instructional time effectively.

Dr. Couch then stated that having been a principal for ten years, he came to realize the importance of establishing relationships with teachers. He stated that what was revealed in the study concerning the importance of the school culture, leadership and standards was on target with what he experienced.

Melissa Pender commented that the report was powerful and that the importance of student selfefficacy and school culture stood out to her during the report. She asked if EOC staff saw any commonality in Tier 1 instruction beyond "bell-to-bell" instruction and goal setting.

Dr. Knight replied there was evidence of LETRS training, though not all schools were involved in LETRS. She stated it was evident that teachers felt responsibility for all students. Dr. May added that while there was not an overall uniformity in the instruction, EOC staff did observe progress monitoring. She also stated that she saw evidence in every school that when a teacher needed to supplement instruction after seeing that a child needed additional support, they were able to get the assistance needed to do so.

Ms. Yow stated they also observed Montessori instruction in some of the schools visited.

Ms. Pender then asked if the schools selected for this part of the study would be observed for a number of years or if new schools would be added.

Dr. Knight responded that these schools would be followed but that new schools would be added as well based on 2024 report cards. She also stated they are looking to add elementary and middle schools. She stated that for the confirmatory phase, the initial partner schools would be reviewed.

Ms. McCumbee then asked if EOC staff noted parental involvement in the visited schools and if they noted any behavioral issues.

Dr. May responded that a focus group of parents at one of the schools indicated that there was not enough parental involvement while the teachers at that same school regarded the parent involvement as fine. She noted this as an example of the differing opinions on the topic. She also added that in general, EOC staff did see a good bit of parental involvement.

Dr. Knight noted the importance of parents forming relationships with their students/ teachers.

This marked the conclusion of the presentation.

Next, Ms. Allen asked Dr. May to present to committee her findings for the Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs Children (ECENC) Fund Report.

Dr. May shared the timeline of the ECENC application process for schools. She then showed a graphic of the participating schools across the state noting that the upstate region had the most ECENC grants awarded at 670 and the most money per student.

She also noted that all CERRA regions had an increase in the number of grants though the funding decreased.

The EOC recommendations for the ECENC program were as follows:

- Convene the advisory committee of the ECENC, which is a requirement of Act 247.
- Offer summative state assessments to ECENC students in public schools.
- Consider the communication around the ECENC program and other scholarships.

Dr. May then asked if there were any questions.

Ferguson asked who should ask schools if they are interested in SC Ready, reiterating that the SC Department of Education's position was that any child could access SC Ready. He said if any schools in the program were trying to access SC Ready, that they could work to make it happen.

Senator Loftis asked for clarification if parent would go through the school to administer the SC assessment to which Ferguson replied yes.

That concluded Dr. May's presentation.

Following this, Ms. Yow was asked to present the recommendations from the SC K-12 Military Readiness Task Force.

She recalled that the task force was assembled in response to the vision statement adopted by the EOC on December 11, 2023 and that in January 2024, it was decided that the EOC would create a working group of Military Recruiters, School Liaison Officers, School Liaison Program Managers, SC Purple Star School District Point of Contacts and Department of Education staff to define and measure the academic and physical characteristics of a "military-ready" student.

It was decided that the working group would make recommendations to the EOC no later than June 30, 2024.

Ms. Yow then provided the guiding questions that led the task force's discussion:

- If we were to define and measure the academic and physical characteristics of militaryready students in K-12 public schools, what would that look like?
- What are the barriers to military readiness in the armed services that may be repaired with a focus on preparedness before enlistment?
- If the purpose of accountability is to incentivize behaviors (from students and adults) that lead to better student outcomes, is including military readiness in an accountability system advisable?

Key findings from the report were as follows:

- A lack of understanding of civics, misunderstanding of military service.
- There is difficulty in defining military readiness due to different requirements for each branch of service.
- SC currently uses the lowest published qualifying score (31) that any military branch uses for career-ready designation, although task force members noted that ASVAB scores are not consistently exclusionary.
- There is not currently a quantifiable, widely used way to measure physical fitness and general health among K-12 students.
- Meeting military readiness markers, enlistment, or receiving designations such as Purple Star should be incentivized for students and schools.

After presenting this, Ms. Yow presented the recommendations from the report. She stated that the recommendations were divided into four categories – accountability, physical fitness, civics education and awards/recognition.

For accountability recommendations, the task force stressed the importance of continuing to incorporate military readiness as a career readiness measure in the accountability system rather than making it a separate category. The task force also recommended that schools use military enlistment and/or entrance into an Officer Commissioning Program as a part of the Five-Year Student Success measure but stressed that the data must be provided from an authorized source and not self-reported.

For the physical fitness recommendation, the task force suggested that as a part of the 2025 cyclical review of the accountability system, an assessment of physical health and fitness be required. Ms. Yow stated that Connecticut includes physical fitness in its accountability.

As the recommendation for civics education, the task force suggested the removal of the state budget proviso that suspends the testing of social studies in grades 3-8.

As the recommendation for awards, it was suggested that military designations such as Purple Star are prominently displayed on a school and/or district's Report Card.

After reviewing the findings and recommendations, Ms. Yow asked if there were any questions. As there were none, Ms. Allen asked for a motion to approve.

Once the motion and the second were given and accepted, the motion passed.

Following this, Ms. Allen asked for a motion to accept the ECENC report. The motion and the second was given and the motion passed.

Next, Ms. Yow reminded members about the upcoming EOC retreat.

Following this, the meeting was adjourned.

### EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

### DATE: September 16, 2024

### SUBCOMMITTEE:

Academic Standards & Assessments Subcommittee

### **ACTION ITEM:**

### Cut Score Concordance of College Readiness Exams

### PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

§ 59-18-900(A) The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish the format of a comprehensive, web-based, annual report card to report on the performance for the State and for individual primary, elementary, middle, high schools, career centers, and school districts of the State. The comprehensive report card must be in a reader-friendly format, using graphics whenever possible, published on the state, district, and school websites, and, upon request, printed by the school districts. The school's rating must be emphasized and an explanation of its meaning and significance for the school also must be reported. The annual report card must serve at least six purposes:

(1) inform parents and the public about the school's performance including, but not limited to, that on the home page of the report there must be each school's overall performance rating in a font size larger than twenty-six and the total number of points the school achieved on a zero to one hundred scale;

(2) assist in addressing the strengths and weaknesses within a particular school;

- (3) recognize schools with high performance;
- (4) evaluate and focus resources on schools with low performance;
- (5) meet federal report card requirements; and
- (6) document the preparedness of high school graduates for college and career.

### **CRITICAL FACTS**

According to concordance tables, the current college ready scores for the ACT and SAT used to determine college readiness in use in the accountability for the ACT and SAT are *not* equivalent to one another.

- The current college ready benchmarks for the ACT produce a composite score of 21
- Current CCR criterion for ACT is set to 20 in Accountability Manual
- The current college ready benchmarks for the SAT produce a combined score of 1010
- Current criterion for SAT is set to 1020 in Accountability Manual

Based on member discussion of options, the staff recommendation is to keep the current College-Ready criterion of  $ACT \ge 20$ , and concordance study to match with  $SAT \ge 1040$ 

### TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

The EOC has considered this as an information item for discussion during three ASA subcommittee meetings:

- November 13, 2023
- January 22, 2024
- May 20, 2024

### ECONOMIC IMPACT FOR EOC

Cost: no impact

### ACTION REQUEST

**For approval** 

For information

### **ACTION TAKEN**

ApprovedNot Approved

AmendedAction deferred (explain)

# EIA Timeline 2024

| Date    | Event   |
|---------|---|
| July 8  | EIA Reports sent to EIA Program Report for<br>completion  |
| Sept 20 | EIA Program Reports due to EOC  |
| Oct 7   | Email EIA Report Participants to request<br>Presentations   |
| Oct 21  | Mail Hard Copies of EIA Reports (as<br>requested) and Summary Sheets; (remind EIA<br>subcommittee members of link posted);<br>request from subcommittee any programs to<br>be presented |
| Nov 4   | EIA Subcommittee Meeting to hear from programs  |
| Nov 18  | EIA Subcommittee Meeting to hear from<br>programs; EOC Staff Recommendations<br>shared  |
| Dec 2   | EIA Subcommittee Meeting to hear from<br>programs (if needed);<br>Subcommittee EIA discusses and approved<br>recommendations  |
| Dec 9   | Full EOC Meeting to adopt EIA recommendations   |

| ID#      | Official EIA Program<br>Name                          | 2023-24 Allocation          | 2024-25 Amount<br>Requested | 2024-25<br>Requested<br>Change | 2023-24 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | 2024-25 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | EOC                   | Governor       | House              | Senate              | Appropriation Act 2024-25 | NOTES:   |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|
|          | South Carolina<br>Department of                       |                             |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
|          | Education   |                             |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 1        | Education Economic and                                | \$8,413,832                 | \$8,413,832                 |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
|          | Development Act (EEDA)                                |                             |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                | <b>#00 700 000</b> | <b>#00 700 000</b>  | <b>\$00,700,000</b>       |  |
| 2        | State Aid to Classrooms<br>Industry Certification s/  | \$709,106,434               | \$983,559,387               | \$274,452,953                  |  |  |                       |                | \$29,720,000       | \$29,720,000        | \$29,720,000              |  |
| 3        | Credentials   | \$3,000,000                 | \$3,000,000                 |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 4        | Adult Education                                       | \$17,073,736                | \$17,073,736                |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 5        | Arts Curricular Grants                                | \$1,487,571                 | \$1,487,571                 |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 6        | Career and Technology<br>Education                    | \$29,572,135                |                             |                                |  |  | \$150,000             |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 7        | Summer Reading Camps                                  | \$7,500,000                 |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| ð<br>Q   | Reading Coaches<br>Assessment /Testing                | \$9,922,556<br>\$27,561,400 |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 9<br>10  | Instructional Materials                               | \$20,922,830                |                             | \$30,000,000                   | \$30,000,000                                   | \$156,000,000                                  | \$36,972,005          | \$15,000,000   | \$0                | \$8,933,747         | \$8,933,747               |  |
| 64       | Math Resources & Support                              | \$1,500,000                 |                             | \$00,000,000                   | \$00,000,000                                   | \$100,000,000                                  | <i>\\</i> 000,012,000 | \$10,000,000   | φ0                 | <i>\\</i> 0,000,111 | φ0,000,1 11               |  |
| 11       | Reading   | \$3,271,026                 | \$3,271,026                 |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 12       | EAA Technical Assistance                              | \$23,801,310                | \$23,801,310                |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 13       | Power School/Data<br>Collection                       | \$7,500,000                 | \$7,500,000                 |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 14       | School Value Added<br>Instrument                      | \$1,400,000                 |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 17       | Half-day 4K   | \$11,513,846                | \$11,513,846                |                                |  |  | (\$3,000,000)         | (\$3,000,000)  | (\$3,000,000)      | (\$3,000,000)       | (\$3,000,000)             |  |
|          | CERDEP (addition of three former half day districts)  |                             |                             |                                |  |  | \$3,000,000           | \$3,000,000    | \$3,000,000        | \$3,000,000         | \$3,000,000               |  |
| 18       | CERDEP - SCDE   | \$63,465,168                | \$77,649,168                | \$14,184,000                   |  |  | \$14,184,000          | \$14,184,000   | \$14,184,000       | \$14,184,000        | \$12,000,000              |  |
|          | CERDEP - First Steps                                  |                             |                             |                                |  |  |                       | \$6,897,691    | \$6,897,691        | \$6,897,691         | \$6,897,691               |  |
| 19       | Teacher of the Year                                   | \$155,000                   | \$155,000                   |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 20       | Teacher Quality Commission                            | \$372,724                   |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 21       | Teacher Supplies                                      | \$17,755,350                | \$17,755,350                |                                |  |  | \$2,700,000           | \$2,700,000    | \$2,700,000        | \$2,700,000         | \$2,700,000               |  |
| 22       | National Board Certification                          | \$44,500,000                |                             |                                |  |  | (\$10,000,000)        | (\$10,000,000) | (\$10,000,000)     | (\$10,000,000)      | (\$10,000,000)            |  |
| 23       | ADEPT   | \$873,909<br>\$2,771,758    |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 24<br>25 | Professional Development<br>Technology                | \$2,771,758<br>\$12,271,826 |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 26       | Other State Agencies'<br>Teacher Salary               | \$15,589,689                |                             | \$1,090,256                    |  |  | \$1,090,256           | \$1,090,256    | \$1,090,256        | \$1,860,822         | \$1,860,822               |  |
| 27       | Family Connection SC                                  | \$300,000                   | \$300,000                   |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    | \$300,000           | \$300,000                 |  |
| 28       | SDE Grants Committee                                  | \$2,004,313                 | \$2,004,313                 |                                | \$16,500,000                                   | \$16,500,000                                   |                       | \$4,774,314    | \$4,774,314        | \$7,000,000         | \$7,000,000               |  |
| 29       | Transportation  | \$22,032,195                |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 76       | Palmetto Math Project                                 |                             | \$10,000,000                | \$10,000,000                   |  |  | \$10,000,000          | \$10,000,000   | \$10,000,000       | \$10,000,000        | \$10,000,000              |  |
| 85       | Teacher Career Ladder<br>Strategic Compensation Pilot |                             | \$10,000,000                | \$10,000,000                   |  |  | \$10,000,000          | \$10,000,000   | \$0                | \$0                 | \$0                       | \$5.0 million in lottery surplus funds allocated to this intiative |
|          | LETRS Training 4K                                     |                             |                             |                                |  |  | \$2,975,000           | \$2,975,000    | \$2,975,000        | \$2,975,000         | \$2,975,000               |  |
|          | TeachSC   |                             |                             |                                |  |  | \$727,650             | \$727,650      | \$727,650          | \$727,650           | \$727,650                 |  |
|          | Partnerships  |                             |                             |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |
| 31       | SC Program for Recruitment of Minority Teachers       | \$339,482                   | \$339,482                   |                                |  |  |                       |                |                    |                     |                           |  |

| ID#    | Official EIA Program<br>Name                                  | 2023-24 Allocation       | 2024-25 Amount<br>Requested | 2024-25<br>Requested<br>Change | 2023-24 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | 2024-25 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | EOC | Governor  | House     | Senate      | Appropriation Act<br>2024-25 | NOTES: |
|--------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------------------------|--------|
|        | USC - Pilot Teacher<br>Recruitment Program (CAP)              | \$750,000                | \$1,200,000                 | \$450,000                      | \$450,000                                      |  |     | \$450,000 | \$450,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$1,200,000                  |        |
|        | SC State University BRIDGE<br>Program (MATTE)                 | \$1,000,000              | \$1,000,000                 |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
|        | Claflin University  | \$400,000                | \$400,000                   |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 35     | Literacy & Distance Learning (P3 60)                          | \$415,000                |                             |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 36     | Reach Out & Read(A850)  | \$1,000,000              | \$1,250,000                 | \$250,000                      |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
|        | Youth Challenge Academy(E<br>240)                             | φ1,000,000               |                             |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
|        | Arts Education( H910)   | \$1,170,000              | \$1,170,000                 |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 39     | Education Oversight<br>Committee                              |                          | \$2,187,264                 | \$394,022                      |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 39.1   | Education Oversight<br>Committee Agency (A850)                | \$1,293,242              | \$1,687,264                 | \$394,022                      |  |  |     |           |           | \$394,022   | \$394,022                    |        |
| 39.2   | Education Data Dashboards<br>(A850)                           | \$3,500,000              |                             | (\$1,500,000)                  |  |  |     |           |           | \$105,978   | \$105,978                    |        |
|        | SC Autism Society   | \$500,000                |                             | <b>#20 F04</b>                 |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
|        | Science P.L.U.S. (A850)<br>STEM Centers SC (H120)             | \$563,406<br>\$2,000,000 |                             | \$36,594<br>\$100,000          |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 13     | Teach For America<br>SC(A850)                                 | \$2,000,000              |                             | \$750,000                      |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 11     | SC Council on Economic<br>Education( H270)                    | \$300,000                | \$450,000                   | \$150,000                      |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45     | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (H270)                 | \$0                      | \$790,933                   | \$75,000                       |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 1/16 1 | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships Agency (H270)          | \$100,000                | \$100,000                   |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45.2   | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (SCMGI)                | \$75,000                 | \$75,000                    |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45.3   | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (SC-WIN)               | \$182,500                | \$182,500                   |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45.4   | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (SCEPC)                | \$75,000                 | \$75,000                    |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45.5   | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (SC-SIC)               | \$127,303                | \$202,303                   | \$75,000                       |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 45.0   | Center for Educational<br>Partnerships (SCGA)                 | \$156,130                | \$156,130                   |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 46     | Centers for Excellence<br>CHE(H030)                           | \$0                      | \$1,137,526                 |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 40.1   | Centers for Excellence<br>Agency CHE (H030)                   | \$55,709                 | \$71,057                    | \$15,348                       |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 46.2   | Centers for Excellence<br>(Citadel- Mathematical<br>Literacy) | \$129,580                | \$0                         | (\$129,580)                    |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 40.3   | Centers for Excellence (CU-<br>CRE2DE)                        | \$0                      | \$0                         |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |
| 46.4   | Centers for Excellence (CU-<br>LEADERS)                       | \$129,969                | \$129,969                   |                                |  |  |     |           |           |             |                              |        |

| ID#      | Official EIA Program<br>Name  | 2023-24 Allocation        | 2024-25 Amount<br>Requested | 2024-25<br>Requested<br>Change | 2023-24 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | 2024-25 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | EOC       | Governor    | House       | Senate      | Appropriation Act<br>2024-25 | NOTES: |
|----------|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|--------|
| 46.5     | Centers for Excellence (CC-<br>APEC)  | \$112,500                 | \$112,500                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 46.6     | Centers for Excellence (FMU-<br>TRIP)                                       | \$129,768                 | \$129,000                   | (\$768)                        |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 46.7     | Centers for Excellence (USC-<br>SC- Teacher)                                | \$0                       | \$0                         |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 46.8     | Centers for Excellence (new program 1 - 23-24)                              | \$115,000                 | \$115,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 46.9     | Centers for Excellence (new program 2 - 23-24)                              | \$115,000                 | \$115,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 46.9     | Centers for Excellence - New<br>Program 3 (24-25)                           |                           | \$115,000                   | \$115,000                      |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 47       | Center of Excellence to<br>Prepare Teachers of<br>Children of Poverty - FMU | \$350,000                 | \$350,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 48       | Regional Education<br>Centers(P3 20)  | \$2,452,000               | \$2,452,000                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             | (\$500,000) | (\$500,000)                  |        |
| 49       | Teacher Loan Program(E1<br>60)  | \$5,089,881               | \$5,089,881                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 50       | Babynet Autism Therapy(J0<br>20)  | \$3,926,408               | \$5,000,000                 | \$1,073,592                    |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 51       | Call Me MiSTER(H1 20)   | \$500,000                 | \$500,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 52       | DJJ Teacher Salaries (N120)   | \$2,600,000               | \$2,600,000                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             | \$136,500                    |        |
| 53       | CERRA (H470)  | \$0                       |                             | \$119,304                      |  |  |           | ·           | ·           |             |                              |        |
| 53.1     | CERRA Agency (H470)   | \$1,298,102               | \$1,498,102                 | \$200,000                      |  |  | \$200,000 | \$200,000   | \$200,000   | \$0         | \$200,000                    |        |
| 53.2     | CERRA- Rural Teacher<br>Recruitment   | \$7,598,392               | \$7,598,392                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 53.3     | CERRA- Pre- collegiate site<br>grants                                       | \$175,000                 | \$175,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 53.4     | CERRA- Teaching Fellows<br>awards   | \$4,462,623               | \$4,381,927                 | (\$80,696)                     |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 55       | Transform SC(H850)  | \$400,000                 | \$400,000                   |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 56       | First Steps to School<br>Readiness  | \$40,007,554              | \$40,369,643                | \$362,089                      |  |  | \$362,089 | \$362,089   | \$362,089   | \$362,089   | \$362,089                    |        |
| 57       | The Continuum   | \$2,500,000               |                             |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 59       | Save the Children   | \$1,000,000               |                             |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             | <b>A</b>                     |        |
| 60<br>61 | Hype<br>SCDE Personnel &  | \$750,000<br>\$11,361,843 |                             |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             | \$200,000                    |        |
| 65       | Operations<br>Jobs for America's<br>Graduates (JAG-SC)                      | \$2,000,000               |                             |                                |  |  |           | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000                  |        |
| 67       | Computer Sci Cert &<br>Professional Learning                                | \$3,000,000               | \$3,000,000                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 68       | Intensive Developmental<br>Education & Therapy- SDE                         | \$2,000,000               | \$2,000,000                 |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
|          | Intensive Developmental<br>Education & Therapy- Public<br>Charter           | \$1,300,000               |                             |                                |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |
| 69       | Project Read  | \$100,000                 |                             | \$50,000                       |  |  |           |             |             | * / ~~~~~   | <b>*</b> / ••• •••           |        |
| 70       | SC TEACHER  | \$1,000,000               |                             |                                | \$2,000,000                                    |  |           | \$500,000   | \$500,000   | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000                  |        |
| 72       | THRIVE ED   |                           | \$550,000                   | \$550,000                      |  |  |           |             |             |             |                              |        |

| ID# | Official EIA Program<br>Name  | 2023-24 Allocation | 2024-25 Amount<br>Requested | 2024-25<br>Requested<br>Change | 2023-24 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | 2024-25 Non-<br>Recurring<br>Request<br>Amount | EOC          | Governor     | House        | Senate       | Appropriation Act<br>2024-25 | NOTES: |
|-----|---|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------|
|     | SC Advanced Placement<br>Partnership                                  |                    |                             |                                |  |  | \$1,500,000  |              |              |              |                              |        |
|     | Department of Corrections   | \$125,000          | \$125,000                   |                                |  |  |              |              |              |              | \$178,750                    |        |
|     | School Safety Building<br>Mapping                                     |                    |                             |                                |  | \$5,000,000                                    |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 1// | CTE Rural Renaissance<br>Initiative                                   |                    | \$15,000,000                | \$15,000,000                   |  |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 1Xh | Critical Needs Teacher<br>Retention                                   |                    |                             |                                |  | \$15,000,000                                   |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 10  | Education Scholarship Trust<br>Fund                                   |                    | \$30,000,000                | \$30,000,000                   | \$2,073,300                                    |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
|     | Character and Resiliency<br>Education (CARE) & Civics<br>Initiatives  |                    |                             |                                |  | \$3,250,000                                    |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 79  | Instructional Support for<br>Districts (iHub/LMS/AMS)                 |                    | \$10,280,000                | \$10,280,000                   | \$10,240,000                                   |  |              |              | \$10,280,000 | \$1          | \$3,794,751                  |        |
|     | TeachSC   |                    | \$727,650                   | \$727,650                      |  |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 81  | Safety Tools for School-<br>Issued Devices                            |                    | \$1,900,000                 | \$1,900,000                    |  |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 88  | Bus Driver Retention Bonus  |                    |                             |                                |  | \$10,582,500                                   |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
|     | Bus Lease/Purchase - 15-Yr<br>Replacement Cycle Maint                 |                    | \$35,000,000                | \$35,000,000                   | \$20,631,000                                   |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
| 83  | Shared IT Services for<br>School Districts                            |                    | \$900,000                   | \$900,000                      |  |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
|     | School Facilities Safety<br>Upgrades and Rural<br>Infrastructure Bank |                    |                             |                                |  | \$20,000,000                                   |              |              |              |              |                              |        |
|     | TOTAL   | \$1,177,370,000    | \$1,603,765,460             | \$426,395,460                  | \$263,166,300                                  | \$231,332,500                                  | \$70,861,000 | \$60,861,000 | \$75,861,000 | \$78,861,000 | \$81,187,000                 |        |
|     |   |                    |                             |                                |  |  |              |              |              |              |                              |        |

NOTE: With any balance in EIA, up to \$1.6 million is for child nutrition program (to pay for reduced-price lunch meals) and up to \$5 million is for instructional materials

# 

# Connect School and District Leaders to the Information They Need to Ensure That Their Students Thrive

K–12 students need in- and out-of-school support to meet their academic and nonacademic needs. To provide this comprehensive academic and social support, district and school leaders need access to information for decisionmaking. But right now, state data systems provide insufficient access to the data that helps individuals, the public, and policymakers answer their questions and make decisions.

Aggregate tools for policymakers, community organizations, and researchers are necessary to assist them in providing insights and addressing emerging and longstanding cross-sector challenges. But individuals need more; they need tools that pull in information from across the statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) and are tailored to their specific needs and the specific questions they are trying to answer. To meet this goal, states must modernize their SLDSs so those systems use information from across agencies and sectors to facilitate access to the information district and school leaders need to support their students' success. For example:

- Data from agencies that administer the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) can help connect eligible families to SNAP benefits.
- Data from foster care agencies can help school counselors, teachers, and case workers work together to better coordinate and support students.
- Connecting K–12 education and Medicaid data can enable schools to more easily seek reimbursement for school-based medical and mental health services, reducing burden and decreasing the potential for errors.

# **AVISION**

Data Quality Campaign

to Transform State Data Systems to Inform People's Pathways through Education and the Workforce State leaders have an opportunity to build and maintain data systems that meet people's current access needs, including the needs of K–12 students and those who support them. Read the Data Quality Campaign's full vision for data access, <u>What Now?</u> <u>A Vision to Transform State Data Systems to Inform People's</u> <u>Pathways through Education and Workforce</u>, for information on various data users and their needs, four other use cases that show what's possible when SLDSs provide tailored access to individuallevel data, and recommendations for state and federal leaders to make this vision a reality.

### HOW TO USE THIS USE CASE

This resource offers leaders a place to start by detailing a use case in which SLDSs are uniquely positioned to support K–12 decisionmaking. Specifically, the use case includes:

- Stories showing what's at stake;
- What different data users should be able to accomplish with the right access to data;
- The types of resources that data users should have access to;
- The policies and programs that will be possible when this use case is realized; and
- Examples of states that are getting started on making data access possible.

USE CASE

# Connect school and district leaders to the information they need to ensure that their students thrive



### ERIC, A MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL, WANTS TO MAKE ACCESSING HEALTH SERVICES AND OTHER RESOURCES EASIER FOR HIS STUDENTS.

Over the years, students and their families have asked Eric about accessing mental health services. And he has noticed that the students who get those services can engage more robustly in school. When students and their families reach out, Eric turns to a resource that includes contact

information for mental health service providers, specific services and resources, and insurance requirements and fees for each service.

Because Eric has this resource, **he can assist students and families in identifying which mental health services are available to the students based on their needs and access to insurance.** He saves his students and families time, energy, and the frustration of trying to navigate multiple social service agencies by helping them quickly locate the services that are most relevant to them. Families can then determine which services are the best fit for students' needs so they can better engage in school and thrive out of school.

Everyone should have access to the information they need to ensure that K–12 students receive necessary support in and out of school. Right now, people like Eric and Jasmine cannot meet the information needs of the students and their families who need it most.



### JASMINE, A DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT, WANTS TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN POLICIES THAT HELP STUDENTS THRIVE WITHIN AND OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL AND BE SUCCESSFUL AFTER THEY GRADUATE.

As a superintendent, Jasmine needs access to data on enrollment, retention, and persistence in postsecondary pathways as well as employment and earnings outcomes. Cross-referencing K–12

data with postsecondary and employment data will allow her to assess the data she has on students' course taking and high school completion to ensure that the academic and supportive programs offered within her district are preparing students for postsecondary success. Jasmine also understands from her own experience and input from her school leaders that students who have access to health, social, and wraparound services to support their academic needs are more engaged and likely to complete school. Thus, Jasmine wants to develop district policies and procedures that help school leaders provide their students with access to both the academic services and the health, social, and wraparound services they need.

Jasmine is able to access and compare K–12, postsecondary, and employment data for the graduates of her district; she is also able to access de-identified health and social services data for students in her district to determine programs school leaders can share with students and families. She uses both academic and social data to improve districtwide curricular programming and intervention programming that support students in accessing the academic, health, and social services they need.

When states change their data systems to enable access, individuals will be able to use data to access, facilitate, and deliver comprehensive educational, health, social services, and other wraparound supports to students.

## WHAT DOES ACCESS LOOK LIKE IN ACTION?

Robust state data systems that prioritize meaningful access to data will meet current and future information needs in the following ways.



### DISTRICT AND SCHOOL LEADERS have access to data that helps them:

**PRIORITIZE** programs and interventions that best support students by:

- Examining outcomes for their schools and identifying where they need to increase access to counselors, advisors, social workers, financial aid, and other benefits designed to support students in K–12 as they prepare for the future.
- Identifying (and facilitating student enrollment in) academic support programs for which the student is eligible early enough to help them thrive in secondary school and have the ability to explore a variety of postsecondary education and career options that align with their interests or goals.
- Matching the student's postsecondary interests with the necessary credentials, skills, prior learning, and social supports to make exploring those interests possible.
- Determining targeted investments that will help students and their families navigate the patchwork of education and career development programs, support services, and other opportunities available to them as they make decisions about postsecondary education or career preparation programs.

• Understanding whether the postsecondary pathway the student chooses to pursue affects the academic, health, social, and economic support services for which the student is eligible.

**FACILITATE** student and family access to services by:

- Identifying health services that meet individual and family needs related to nutrition, substance use disorder, and physical and mental health.
- Identifying programs and supports to assist with housing stability.
- Identifying and supporting student enrollment in needbased social and economic support programs that are available to them, such as SNAP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).
- Identifying and supporting student enrollment in health, social, and wraparound support services that are available from local nonprofit organizations partnering with the school district.

**ADVOCATE** for access to varied academic, economic, and social supports, whether offered at the school or through school-based partnerships with providers.

### INDIVIDUAL ACCESS CHECKLIST

States must provide access to data that is:

- Specific to the individual's role and the questions that they are trying to answer;
- ✓ Timely;
- Able to be manipulated and help them take action;
- ✓ Translated into languages other than English;
- ✓ Secure; and
- Longitudinal.



# SCHOOL-BASED

SUPPORT STAFF (counselors, social workers, case managers, and health care professionals) have access to data that helps them:

- **AID** students and their families working to identify, assess their eligibility for, and enroll in any public benefits programs (e.g., nutrition, health care, housing, transportation) that might be available to them or their families and could help support them.
- REFER and ENROLL students into different kinds of support programs offered through education and other sectors based on students' individual needs to keep them on track for educational, social, and emotional success.
- **MONITOR** changes in eligibility or enrollment for certain federal, state, or locally funded services to ensure that individual students and their families receive the full range of possible benefits. These benefits might include students being eligible for school-based Medicaid or students who are experiencing homelessness being eligible for supports specified in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- **COORDINATE** with external state agency staff, such as foster care case managers, to understand and provide additional services for students and their families.

Tools and information are available to other individuals and organizations that play a role in facilitating school-based support for students, including but not limited to:

- Social workers;
- Case managers;
- Health care professionals;

- Foster youth organizations; and
- Disability services staff.



THE PUBLIC (community members) has access to data that helps them:

- HOLD the government accountable for providing access to all the academic and nonacademic supports students need to thrive, including connections to workforce, health, housing, transportation, economic, and nutrition resources.
- **EFFECT** change in a manner that supports the areas of greatest student need in their community.
- **IDENTIFY** and learn from areas of promising growth in supporting students' academic and nonacademic needs.
- **ANSWER** questions about different school-based youth programs and their impact on students' academic and social-emotional outcomes.

### PUBLIC ACCESS CHECKLIST

States must provide access to open data, aggregate data, and dashboards that:

- Are easy to understand and navigate;
- Are available in languages other than English;
- Are disaggregated by different groups of students and by program/school;
- Are dynamic and able to be queried and customized; and
- Include best practice indicators, such as those in the <u>Education-</u> <u>to-Workforce Indicator</u> Framework.



### POLICYMAKERS

(agency leaders, legislators, local school boards, and district leaders) have access to data that helps them: PLAN, allocate resources, and answer questions, such as:

- What are students' primary academic, health care, and housing needs, and which investments and partnerships will fulfill those needs?
- How do school-based support services and programs affect comprehensive student growth (e.g., academic, social, emotional)?
- How can our school district better prepare middle and high schools for the scheduling adjustments, additional supports, and staffing needed to best support students as they transition from one school level to the next?
- How can our school district better prepare middle and high schools with the scheduling adjustments, additional supports, and staffing needed to best support students who transfer from one school to another?
- How does access to safe and healthy housing affect students, and what state or federal funding streams are available to assist students with access to safe and healthy housing?

- How does access to free or low-cost public transportation affect access to additional academic, health care, and housing resources that can provide support to students and their families?
- What health care services do students have access to in schools? How can states assist school districts in using Medicaid funding or data on additional health care services to fill gaps in existing school-based health care services?
- Which support services and out-of-school programs should have additional resources directed toward them to account for increased demand and positive outcomes?
- What college and career pathways do students explore after leaving the K–12 system? What academic and nonacademic programs and supports did those students receive?

### POLICYMAKER ACCESS CHECKLIST

States must provide access to data that:

- Can be viewed statewide and tailored to answer policymakers' specific questions;
- Enables policy creation, evaluation, and adjustments as needed; and
- Enables effective management of programs.

### WHAT WILL REALIZING THIS VISION MAKE POSSIBLE?

Access to data helps people make decisions and improves state and local investments in education and workforce pathways and the supports necessary to make those pathways a reality for all individuals.

### When state leaders give people tailored, individual access to the data they need, they also support the success of:

- Cross-agency support for students and their families based on their education, health, and other social service needs;
- One-stop-shop and "no wrong door" enrollment approaches, which provide families with assistance in accessing support and wraparound services (e.g., health care, social safety net programs like TANF and food support, afterschool programs) in a simplified, easy-to-navigate manner;
- Needs assessments conducted by school and district leaders so they can identify additional in-school support services based on their student population; and
- Easier access to programs and services facilitated by community-based organizations.

# **STATES GETTING STARTED**

This work is ambitious. While some states and districts have created resources that allow individuals, the public, and system leaders to use data to **make** decisions about comprehensive supports for K–12 students, leaders must go farther to give people the kind of data access they need. Examples of how cities and states have gotten started include the following:

### SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS AND TOOLS

- The <u>Appalachian Cradle to Career Partnership</u> is a partnership of Partners for Rural Impact, Save the Children, the Eastern Kentucky Concentrated Employment Program, Fahe, the Brushy Fork Leadership Institute, the Appalachian Educational Service Agency, and the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation. It provides cradle-to-career academic support, workforce development opportunities, and access to social services for students and their families in Eastern Kentucky.
- <u>Growing Up NYC</u> is a tool created by the New York City Mayor's Office of Economic Opportunity and Children's Cabinet that provides families a way to find public state and local programs that satisfy their needs and are available to them based on student age, developmental or educational needs, family income, and more.
- The <u>Nashville After Zone Alliance</u> (NAZA) is a partnership of the Nashville Public Library, Metro Nashville Public Schools, the Mayor's Office, and more than 20 youth development organizations that provide out-ofschool-time learning opportunities for Nashville youth. NAZA's website provides an interactive map that allows anyone to look up program offerings by school, including information about transportation and enrollment requirements.
- <u>Wisconsin's Pandemic Electronic Benefits Transfer</u> is a partnership of the Wisconsin Department of Health Services, the Department of Children and Families, and the Division of School Nutrition at the Department of Public Instruction. During the COVID-19 pandemic, this program was able to use and share existing data to distribute new electronic benefit transfer cards to families not already enrolled in assistance programs (e.g., SNAP) and directly transfer meal stipends via those cards without requiring any actions from families.

### LOCAL INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS

- The <u>Allegheny County Data Warehouse</u> is a countywide data system containing more than 20 categories of data—including child welfare, public benefit, housing status, and education data—that allows providers and decisionmakers to better target programs and supports to students in need. For instance, integrated attendance data makes uplifting students who are involved with both the child welfare and K–12 systems easier.
- The <u>Baltimore City Youth Data Hub</u> is an integrated data system that is hosted by <u>Baltimore's Promise</u> and brings together data from across agencies, including community-based organizations. Connecting data from community-based organizations provides a more complete picture of the experiences of youth and their families, allowing providers and policymakers to effectively and equitably support them.
- The <u>Santa Clara DataZone</u> is a countywide data system that incorporates data from multiple agencies, with some agencies providing nightly updates to equip educators and support staff with timely data. Santa Clara's Foster Vision tool pulls data from juvenile justice and children and youth services systems, among others, to provide educators and case workers with up-to-date information about impacted students, including attendance, behavior, and academic data.

#### SCHOOL-BASED SERVICES

- The <u>Ohio Healthy Students Profiles</u> leverage data linked between the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Department of Medicaid to publish school-level aggregate data about health care interactions, needs, and educational measures for students participating in Medicaid. These profiles are available to the public and can help school leaders understand the needs of their students and make decisions about future programming and partnerships that can better support student well-being.
- Louisiana's <u>School-Based Medicaid Services</u> leverage data linked among state education agencies, local education agencies, and the state Medicaid office to streamline billing and simplify reimbursement, freeing up additional funding for school-based services. For example, creating this linkage in the East Baton Rouge School District allowed the district to hire another 188 mental health counselors, providing increased services to students.
- The <u>Virginia Department of Education</u> is piloting a tool that provides practitioners working with foster care youth with access to those students' education records when they move schools so they are able to get the support they need faster. With a connected P–20W data system, this tool could expand even further to connect with social services data, providing important placement and eligibility data that school counselors could use to coordinate with foster care case managers.