

From: Kate Wallace (Kate@excelined.org) <Kate@excelined.org>
To: Soura, ChristianChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov
CC: Card, RachelRachelCard@gov.sc.gov
Cari Miller (Cari@excelined.org)Cari@excelined.org
Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)MaryLaura@excelined.org
Josh Venable (Josh@excelined.org)Josh@excelined.org
Josh Venable (Josh@excelined.org)Josh@excelined.org
Date: 3/26/2013 11:58:22 AM
Subject: Feedback on SB 516 - K-3 Literacy
Attachments: Feedback on SB 516 - K-3 Literacy.docx

Christian:

Happy Tuesday!

Attached is our line-by-line feedback on SB 516. Overall, we are impressed by the comprehensive nature of the bill. However, we do have some questions and concerns with certain provisions that we've outlined below and more specifically in the attached bill language. If you have any questions about our feedback, do not hesitate to reach out.

- Children subject to the retention policy should be identified based on how they test against a standard, not their peers. This can be done by capturing those students who score the lowest achievement level on the state reading assessment, for example. *(p. 3 and p. 8)*
- Some components of the District PK-12 reading plan requirements are too input-driven, and not focused enough on outcomes. *(top of p. 7)*
- PreK and K literacy screeners should be aligned to PreK and Kindergarten state standards relevant to the domains specified (language and literacy development, mathematical thinking, physical well-being, and social-emotional development) in bill; the screener's main purpose is to assess how ready a kid is the moment he enters school and inform teachers' instruction. *(top of p. 8)*
- This policy should be implemented a year sooner than the bill calls for. The state department could use 2013-2014 to build infrastructure and begin enforcing retention policy 2014-2015. There's no reason to wait and let another class of kids move on unprepared. *(top of p. 9)*
- The bottom of the bill has extensive language about reading certifications and teacher prep programs requirements. This whole section seems overly prescriptive. The fiscal note for this would be exorbitant, and it appears to fall on the teacher. ExcelinEd recommends scrapping all these inputs and instead directing the DOE to revise the certification tests to reflect scientifically based reading research. *(p. 11-12)*

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Kate

Kate Wallace
State Advocacy Director
Foundation for Excellence in Education
215 S. Monroe St., Ste. 420
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 391-3071 - Direct

(904) 304-9577 - Cell

kate@excelined.org

Follow the Foundation on Facebook and Twitter

