

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Advanced Placement Program

Program Director: Marc Drews

Telephone: 803-734-5836

Fax: 803-734-5953

E-mail: mdrews@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What is the program mission statement and what were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed).*

The mission of the Advanced Placement (AP) program is to provide high school students the opportunity to participate in classes that are invariably more rigorous and in-depth than other high school course offerings. The program objectives for FY 2003–04 were to

- increase the number of students scoring three or higher on AP exams;
- increase the number of minority students enrolled in AP courses; and
- increase the number of AP examinations taken by students.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.*

A report of data from the May 2004 Advanced Placement Examinations was provided by The College Board to the Department of Education in August 23, 2004. These data reported below are from the report to the Department.

- Nearly 56 percent (55.6 percent) of South Carolina students scored three or higher on 2004 AP exams. In 2003, the number scoring three or higher was 56.6 percent.
- In 2004, 2,181 minority students took the AP exams. This is a slight decrease from the 2,198 minority students who took AP exams in 2003.
- In 2004, there were 10,988 students taking AP examinations. This is an increase of 342 students from 2003 (10,646).
- In 2004, 18,044 AP examinations were taken. This is an increase of 615 exams compared to 2003 (17,429) and 1,416 exams over 2002 (16,628).

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objectives of 2004–05 remain the same.

- increase the number of students scoring three or higher on AP exams.
- increase the number of minority students enrolled in AP courses.
- increase the number of AP examinations taken by students.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2003-04?

Data from The College Board will be used to assess the program objectives.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2003-04, will be met?

The state's seven highest performing schools (those with the highest percentage of students scoring three and higher) have been invited to host a regional workshop to focus on instructional strategies and resources designed to increase student performance. The SDE will also target support in Greenville County where 21 percent of the state's AP exams were administered in 2004. Efforts are also underway to assure that all AP teachers are properly endorsed with documentation from school principals.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Advanced Placement Program

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$2,514,265

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$3,078,265

22 percent Increase Requested over FY2004-05 Base

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

The SDE requested increase to support FY06 AP efforts is \$564,000. This amount is calculated based on the projected increase in students taking the AP courses, the costs of materials to support each student, the increase in schools offering IB programs, and the larger number of teachers needing graduate institutes.

- Costs of AP instructional materials and exams. Request an increase of \$500,000. The average cost of books and supplies is approximately \$80 to \$90 per student, whereas the available funding currently allows only \$25 per student. This increase will help offset some of the costs for schools. During FY05, \$2,043,875.00 will support 19,000 exams (including the 350 from the Governor Schools) at \$75 per exam, plus the cost of the part of the IB exams and about \$30 for materials and supplies. All of these dollars are distributed in an allocation to the districts.
- AP Teacher Institutes. Request an increase of \$64,000. The number of AP summer institutes offerings has decreased in FY05 due to insufficient funds. Additional funding of \$64,000 is needed to increase the number of courses necessary to meet teacher needs in Summer 2006.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

- Costs of AP instructional materials and exams. Request an increase of \$500,000. The average cost of books and supplies is approximately \$80 to \$90 per student, whereas the available funding currently allows only \$25 per student. This increase will help offset some of the costs for schools. During FY05, \$2,043,875.00 will support 19,000 exams (including the 350 from the Governor Schools) at \$75 per exam, plus the cost of the part of the IB exams and about \$30 for materials and supplies. All of these dollars are distributed in an allocation to the districts.
- AP Teacher Institutes. Request an increase of \$64,000. The number of AP summer institutes offerings has decreased in FY05 due to insufficient funds. Additional funding of \$64,000 is needed to increase the number of courses necessary to meet teacher needs in Summer 2006.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$1,983,814	\$2,633,814	\$2,514,265	\$3,078,265
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	12,176	39,467	160,983	0
TOTAL:	\$1,995,990	\$2,673,281	\$2,675,248	\$3,078,265

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	1,806,285	2,247,643	2,515,248	2,854,265
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Colleges offering AP institutes	84,780	145,106	160,000	224,000
Budget Reduction	65,458	119,549	0	0
Balance Remaining	39,467	160,983	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,995,990	\$2,673,281	\$2,675,248	\$3,078,265
# FTES:	*.30	*.30	*.30	*.30

* Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for .30 of an FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$30,000) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Gifted and Talented Program

Program Director: Wayne Lord

Telephone: 803-734-8335

Fax: 803-734-3927

E-mail: wlord@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the Gifted and Talented program is to provide an educational program to students who are identified as demonstrating high performance ability or potential in academic and/or artistic areas. The educational program must go beyond that normally provided by the general school program in order for students to achieve their potential. The 2003–04 goals were as follows:

- All districts will have written goals and objectives for their gifted and talented programs that are in compliance with State Board Regulation 43-220.
- Quantifiable measures for the gifted and talented program will be established.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

- Regulation 43-220 was amended by the State Board of Education in January 2004 and approved by the General Assembly in their legislative session. The amended regulation requires a written three-year plan for gifted and talented programs with annual updates. This amended regulation also outlines reporting of student data that will facilitate measuring the impact of gifted and talented services. Baseline data will be collected in the fall of 2005.
- Districts delayed preparation of a written plan during the 2003–04 year pending the final requirements that might be addressed in the amended Regulation 43-220.
- The Department received a Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education Program three-year grant. A research and evaluation initiative on state gifted and talented programs will be initiated through the grant.
- 71,293 students were served in gifted and talented programs during the 2003–04 school year. This represents 13 percent of the state's population in grades three through twelve. This is an increase from 67,882 in the 2002–03 school year.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Districts will prepare a three-year written plan for their gifted and talented programs and submit the plan for review to the Department.
- Districts will submit data of the performance of gifted and talented students on PACT, AP, IB, SAT or ACT examinations to establish baseline data.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

- A written three-year plan will be received from each district in the fall of 2005.
- Data on the performance of gifted and talented students on state and national assessments will be gathered in the fall of 2005.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

- Districts will be offered state and regional training in the preparation of a district plan.
- Districts will be provided the most recent print resource on program evaluation of gifted and talented programs.
- Regional groups to support professional development in gifted education will be established with quarterly meetings.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Gifted and Talented Program

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$29,497,533

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

Total amount requested \$54,806,471

Percent Change over FY 2004 85 percent increase

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

The current appropriation for the EIA Gifted and Talented Program is \$29,497,533. Academic programs receive \$25,692,780 and artistic programs receive \$2,814,753. The Junior Academy of Science receives \$100,000 and the Department uses \$850,000 to provide teacher training and to screen students for program eligibility.

To fully fund the program in 2005–06 using the data of number of students served in 2003–04

- the per pupil cost for the academic program is \$2,290 X .30 X 71,267 students for a total of \$48,960,429;
- add to that figure \$4,896,942 which represents 10% for the artistic program;
- add \$850,000 for teacher training and screening of students for program eligibility; and
- add \$100,000 to support the Junior Academy of Science.

The total funding required to fund the program in FY06 is \$54,806.471.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Growth in the number of students identified for academically gifted and talented program services and the state's failure to fund the program have created significant problems for districts. Students are not served in an appropriate instructional setting with a differentiated curriculum, and students are not achieving at high levels in their strength areas.

A 2003 national policy study identified South Carolina as a leader in the development of policy related to gifted and talented programs. However, these policies have never been implemented completely due to the lack of funding. The state will never evaluate the impact of gifted and talented programs in a valid and reliable manner until funding for the program sustains and supports the best practices set forth in our policies. It is highly probable that fewer gifted and talented students will perform at the proficient or advanced level as funding does not keep pace with the program needs.

From a review of the data submitted by districts, the following information was compiled:

- There were 71,267 students served in academically gifted programs in the state during the 2003–04 school year.
- For the 2004–05 school year, the state provides 69 percent of the required funding. Moreover, this level of funding is based on base student cost that is lower than the base student cost of FY 99 when there were only 51,009 students in academically gifted programs.

- Districts are being asked to serve more students, to be more accountable for student performance, and to provide a greater variety of services with less state funding.
- There are no data to describe accurately the status of artistic programs. Anecdotal information suggests that many districts either provide no service or have an extremely limited artistic program.

FISCAL YEAR	Base Student Cost	135-day GT Academic from Previous School Year	.30 WPU Allocation if fully funded	Academic Funding Available	Actual Per Pupil Funding	
FY99	\$1,879	51,009	\$563.70	\$21,299,925	\$428.41	76 percent
FY00	\$1,937	53,098	\$581.00	\$25,025,023	\$470.69	81 percent
FY01	\$2,012	54,817	\$603.60	\$27,040,023	\$494.95	82 percent
FY02	\$2,073	60,493	\$621.90	\$27,040,023	\$446.34	72 percent
FY02 budget reduction	\$2,073	60,493	\$621.90	\$24,319,943	\$402.02	64 percent
FY03	\$2,033	64,579	\$609.90	\$25,607,780	\$397.66	65 percent at reduced Base Student Cost and an increased state GT population
FY04	\$1,777	67,882	533.10	\$25,607,780	\$377.12	70 percent at a reduced Base Student Cost and an increased state GT population
FY05	\$1,853	71,267	555.60	\$25,692,780	\$360.38	69 percent at a Base Student Costs lower than 1999 and 20,000 additional students.

The program objectives, if fully funded, would be to establish baseline data to determine the impact of services on student achievement when the resources to deliver the program as outlined in regulation are provided.

Districts will submit a three-year plan for gifted and talented services and annual performance of academically gifted and talented students on PACT, AP, IB, and SAT/ACT examinations.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$29,899,783	\$29,497,533	\$29,497,533	\$54,806,471
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$29,899,783	\$29,497,533	\$29,497,533	\$54,806,471

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services (testing)	0	456,785	456,785	456,785
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	29,057,533	28,550,002	28,547,560	54,049,686
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: CHE Proviso	402,250	0	0	0
Jr. Academy Science Proviso	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher Training	104,020	123,940	200,000	200,000
Balance Remaining	235,980	266,806	193,188	0
TOTAL:	\$29,899,783	\$29,497,533	\$29,497,533	\$54,806,471
# FTES:	*1	*1	*1	*1

* Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for one FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$92,100) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Services for Students with Disabilities

Program Director: Susan D. DuRant

Telephone: 803-734-8806

Fax: 803-734-4824

E-mail: sdurant@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

To provide a free appropriate public education for trainable and profoundly mentally disabled students.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Supplemental funding was provided to districts for the provision of a free appropriate public education for 2,787 students. A proviso directed that \$250,000 of the appropriated funds be provided to the South Carolina Autism Society for the Parent-School Partnership.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

To provide a free appropriate public education for trainable and profoundly mentally disabled students. There has been no change. Objectives have not changed from previous year.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

The measures will include the distribution of the allocation and the number of students. The Office of Exceptional Children, under its general supervision responsibility, monitors school districts re: their implementation of IDEA.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Program monitoring and the timely distribution of funds.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Services for Students with Disabilities

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$4,205,017

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

No increase is requested for 2005–06.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

These funds will again be utilized to assist in the provision of a free appropriate public education for profoundly and trainable mentally disabled students. This will assist in maintaining the program. A proviso directs that \$250,000 of the appropriated funds be provided to the South Carolina Autism Society for the Parent-School Partnership.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$4,105,017	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,105,017	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	3,855,017	3,855,017	3,955,017	3,955,017
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
SC Autism Society	241,750	238,653	250,000	250,000
Reduction to SC Autism Society	8,250	11,347	0	0
Carry Forward to Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,105,017	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017
# FTES	0	0	0	0

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Junior Scholars

Program Director: Sallie Spade

Telephone: 803-734-8485

Fax: 803-734-0796

E-mail: sspade@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The South Carolina Junior Scholars Program was developed by the State Department of Education during the 1985–86 school year to identify eighth-grade students with exceptional academic talent and to determine strategies for their inclusion in special programs. The program is designed to identify and recognize eighth-grade students with exceptionally high scholastic achievement and intellectual ability. In collaboration with South Carolina colleges and universities, the State Department of Education sponsors summer opportunities for Junior Scholars that broaden their individual interests, facilitate their intellectual growth, and promote their scholastic achievement. The summer opportunities provided by South Carolina colleges and universities were well attended this year and provided exceptional benefits for those Junior Scholars who participated in the summer camps.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

This past school year, 2003–04, 8,516 eighth-grade students from 85 school districts qualified, based on their seventh-grade Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT) scores; and out of that number of qualified students, 7,743 were administered the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT). Out of the qualifying pool, a total of 3,668 eighth-grade students from across the state qualified and were recognized as South Carolina Junior Scholars. In collaboration with several South Carolina colleges and universities, the State Department of Education sponsored summer opportunities for Junior Scholars. This year, six camps were sponsored by the following colleges and universities: Clemson University, Benedict College, University of South Carolina, Claflin University, Coastal Carolina University, and the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics. The camps offered a wide variety of opportunities including programs such as marine science, architecture, biology, English, advanced math, engineering, biotechnology and computer interfacing, interdisciplinary studies in creativity, space and space flight, communication skills, computer science, physics, and astronomy.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The South Carolina Junior Scholars Program is designed to identify and recognize eighth-grade students with exceptionally high scholastic achievement and intellectual ability. The State Department of Education will collaborate with institutions of higher learning in South Carolina to sponsor summer opportunities for these Junior Scholars to broaden their individual interests, facilitate their intellectual growth, and promote their scholastic achievement.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Students must have scored advanced or proficient in English language arts and mathematics on the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT) in the seventh grade to be eligible to take the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) in the eighth grade. Eligible students who score greater than or equal to 50 on the PSAT in verbal, math, or writing will be identified as South Carolina Junior Scholars.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The South Carolina Junior Scholars Identification and Development Program reflects the growing statewide effort to improve education in South Carolina and responds to the needs of students possessing unique abilities. The purpose of the program is to identify students with exceptionally high scholastic achievement and intellectual ability and to provide opportunities for these students that will facilitate their intellectual growth, broaden their individual interests, and promote their scholastic achievement.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Junior Scholars

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation:

\$109,578

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base:

\$109,578
0% change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06: *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding: *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

The South Carolina Junior Scholars Program is designed to identify and recognize eighth-grade students with exceptionally high scholastic achievement and intellectual ability. The State Department of Education will collaborate with institutions of higher learning in South Carolina to sponsor summer opportunities for these Junior Scholars to broaden their individual interests, facilitate their intellectual growth, and promote their scholastic achievement.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested:

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History:

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$51,558	\$51,558	\$51,558	\$51,558
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other Agencies	29,908	29,908	28,550	28,550
Other Entities	150,490	150,490	143,659	143,659
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$223,767	\$223,767

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	51,519	49,168	51,558	51,558
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Other Agencies	12,188	15,000	15,000	15,000
College and University Grants	55,695	43,020	28,635	58,020
Governor's School	0	18,000	14,385	20,000
Budget Reductions	1,701	2,340	0	0
Transfer	110,048	104,378	114,189	79,189
Balance Remaining	805	50	0	0
TOTAL:	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$223,767	\$223,767
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Tech Prep

Program Director: Dr. James R. Couch, Ed.D.

Telephone: 803-734-8564

Fax: 803-734-3525

E-mail: jcouch@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Mission: To develop an integrated learning system that enables students to be successful in a global economy and rapidly changing workforce.

Objectives:

1. The number of students participating in School-to-Work (STW) activities will increase by 1%.
2. The number of teachers and administrators participating in STW staff development, to include applied academic training, Educators in Industry courses, etc., will increase by 2%.
3. The number of partnerships developed with local businesses will increase by 2%.
4. The number of career and technology education courses articulated with postsecondary education will increase by 3%.

Note: The percentages of increase have been lowered from FY2002 due to the large numbers currently reported.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Objective #1 – Objective Met

The number of students participating in STW activities did increase significantly once again (146,213, FY03; 161,953, FY04). In addition to the annual STW activities reported via the sixteen Tech Prep consortia through the state's school districts, students across the state participated in the National Groundhog Job Shadowing Day in February. While there would have been some duplication of counting on this particular STW activity, over 31,000 students participated in that singular event. This fact, added to the over 130,000 STW activities reported on the state's annual STW activities survey, resulted in the attainment of this objective significantly beyond the 1%.

Objective #2 – Objective Met

Teachers, counselors, and administrators participated in STW training activities during sessions, conferences, and state meetings offered by the Office of Career and Technology Education (1,300, FY03; 1,400+, FY04). Career Development Facilitator Training for approximately 75 educators served by the state's sixteen TP consortia, 50 Educators in Industry course participants, fall and spring professional development conferences attended by over 200 educators, and the over 1250 attendees at the Office's 2004 Education and Business Summit. This data does not include the technical assistance provided by

OCTE staff to educators in the field that would qualify as STW profession development. Additionally, the sixteen consortia offered applied academic training to English, math and science teachers. The OCTE also offers a New Career and Technology Education Administrators Institute each year. Thirty (30) additional educators participated in this training that included a significant amount of STW-related instruction and activities. The 200+ individuals participating in these activities resulted in the more that 2% increase.

Objective #3 – Objective Met

The number of partnerships developed with local businesses increased for the third consecutive year (11,964, FY02; 24,058, FY03; 27,055, FY04). Business partners are an important part of the successes enjoyed by schools and school districts, thus students, in our state. Again this year, especially as a result of the growth in our pre-engineering sites around the state via Lego League and Project Lead The Way, we have realized additional business partnership growth. South Carolina held its first Regional Robotics Competition in 2004 and the state had a growth in robotics teams of fifteen (15) teams. Each of these teams requires significant school-business partnerships in order to generate funds for travel to competitions and provide engineering-level technical support to team members. Business partners also serve on coordinating boards in our Tech Prep consortia, offer teacher internships, and job shadowing opportunities for students. These examples of school-business partnerships along with the growth of High Performing Partnerships through the State Chamber of Commerce resulted in this objective being successfully addressed.

Objective #4 – Objective Not Met – Results Remained Constant

The number of career and technology education courses articulated with postsecondary education increased most significantly as a result of the increased participation in the pre-engineering curriculum and the addition of FIRST Robotics teams in the state (735, FY02; 728, FY03; 733, FY04). (See objective #3 above.) Each of the fifteen sites must have implemented the Project Lead The Way curriculum and these five (5) courses are recognized for articulated credit at the University of South Carolina. While S. C. does not have a statewide articulation agreement, progress has been made toward that end. That fact, resulting from the work of a statewide committee studying the potential to transition to a statewide articulation agreement led to additional courses being added to the “master course list.”

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Mission: To develop an integrated learning system that enables students to be successful in a global economy and rapidly changing workforce.

Objectives:

1. The number of students participating in School-to-Work (STW) activities will increase by 1%.
2. The number of teachers and administrators participating in STW staff development, to include applied academic training, Educators in Industry courses, etc., will increase by 2%.
3. The number of partnerships developed with local businesses will increase by 1%.
4. The number of career and technology education courses articulated with postsecondary education will increase by 1%.

Note: The percentages for objectives #3 and #4 have been lowered due to the large numbers currently reported in these areas. Additionally, while there may be some growth in the pre-engineering curriculum promoting business-education partnership involvement, last year's growth was significant. The S. C. Regional Robotics Competition has been a source of support and encouragement for business-education partnership growth. The increase in the number of articulated courses in 2003-04 was directly connected with the growth the pre-engineering sites and the fact that the OCTE initiated a partnership with the University of South Carolina in order to facilitate the articulation of pre-engineering coursework from the state's high schools to the University. Additionally, South Carolina does not have a statewide articulation agreement making the probability of adding significantly to the number of articulated courses that already exist less likely.

Note: The termination of the STW Federal Grant on September 30, 2004 certainly has the potential to negatively affect the results reported for these objectives.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Data will be collected from school districts and the sixteen Tech Prep consortia to determine the numbers of students, teachers, administrators, and business partners participating in STW activities.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Technical assistance and professional development activities will be provided by staff in the Office of Career and Technology Education during the school year to assure that objectives will be met. The OCTE will continue to offer statewide professional development opportunities via the fall and spring professional development conferences and the annual Education and Business Summit.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Tech Prep

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$4,064,843

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$4,064,843

0\$ change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

This request is to maintain the current level of funding to continue to increase student participation in School-to-Work (STW) activities, keep teachers updated on business requirements, develop business partnerships, and articulate courses with post-secondary.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$4,257,742	\$4,257,742	\$4,064,483	\$4,064,483
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	150	150	0
TOTAL:	\$4,257,742	\$4,257,892	\$4,064,633	\$4,064,483

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$4,117,246	\$4,064,483	\$4,064,633	\$4,064,483
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	140,346	193,109	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	150	150	0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,257,742	\$4,257,742	\$4,064,633	\$4,064,483
# FTES:	*0	*0	*0	*0

*All funds are flow-through. No funds are retained for personnel.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Arts Curricula

Program Director: Deborah Smith Hoffman, Ph.D.

Telephone: 803-734-0323

Fax: 803-734-6142

E-mail: dhoffman@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The primary objective of the Art Curricular Grant fund was to promote the visual and performing arts through grants to districts and schools for the implementation of the *2003 South Carolina Visual and Performing Arts Curriculum Standards*. Additional funds were used to promote the visual and performing arts through grants to assist with the Arts in Basic Curriculum Project, the South Carolina Center for Dance Education, the South Carolina Alliance for Arts Education, and the South Carolina Arts Assessment Program.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

We served the students of twenty districts and fifty-two schools through the Art Curricular Grant fund. Additional monies were spent on eighteen 2004 professional development institutes for visual and performing arts teachers, administrators, and classroom teachers.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The arts struggle in districts and school; and our primary objective is to sustain the good work of the districts and schools that have implemented a three-year strategic plan for the arts and to continue helping with the strategic planning process and the special project grants.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

A copy of district's and school's accomplishments in the arts is available, and we are going to an on-line survey that will give us additional information about the schools and districts.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Each proposal lists the following: Needs Assessment, Goals and Objectives that match the Needs Assessment, Strategies and Action Steps that match the Goals and Objectives, and a summative and formative Evaluation that gives the raters of the proposals clear indications of the planned Evaluation.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Arts Curricula

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$1,597,584 plus \$15,642 in Aid to Other State Agencies and \$475 in Aid to Other Entities for a total of \$1,613,701.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The total amount requested is \$1,613,701 (\$1,597,584 plus \$15,642 in Aid to Other State Agencies and \$475 in Aid to Other Entities), a 0% change over the 2004-05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to provide sustained services and expand outreach to assist more districts and schools to submit grants. With only 20 districts (52 schools) receiving arts curricula grants, we know there is room to grow. In addition, the professional development institutes need to be maintained as this is the major vehicle to providing standards-based training for teachers in four arts areas statewide: visual, music, theatre, and dance. The arts are core areas in federal legislation where teachers must be highly qualified.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$1,597,584	\$1,597,584	\$1,597,584	\$1,597,584
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	44,758	0	0	0
Aid to state agencies	15,643	15,643	15,643	15,643
Aid to other entities	475	475	475	475
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	163,038	186,890	
TOTAL:	\$1,658,460	\$1,776,740	\$1,800,592	\$1,613,702

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$1,442,708	\$1,500,486	\$1,800,592	\$1,613,702
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	52,714	73,246	0	0
Transfer	0	16,118	0	0
Balance Remaining	163,038	186,890	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,658,460	\$1,776,740	\$1,800,592	\$1,613,702
# FTES:	*1	*1	*1	*1

* Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for one FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$85,000) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004-05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Local School Innovation

Program Director: Genie Frontz

Telephone: 803-734-8320

Fax: 803-734-8701

E-mail: gfrontz@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What is the program mission statement and what were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003-04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed).*

The program objective is to provide funds to districts and schools for developing innovative classroom practices to improve student and school performance. The effectiveness measure is to improve student and school performance as measured by improvement in the report card rating of 20 percent of the schools rated unsatisfactory.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003-04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.*

The objective for 2003-04 was met. Of the schools rated unsatisfactory on the 2002 report card, 32 percent rated above unsatisfactory on the 2003 report card.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objective for the current fiscal year remains the same. The effectiveness measure for 2004-05 is to improve student and school performance as measured by improvement in the report card rating of 10 percent of the schools rated unsatisfactory on the 2003 report card as compared to the 2004 report card.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05?

The data will be the improvement in student and school performance as measured by the percent of schools rated unsatisfactory on the 2003 report card that receive a higher rating on the 2004 report card.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05, will be met?

The Department conducts desk audits of district strategic plan annual updates. Furthermore, the Department conducts fiscal oversight of district and school expenditures of innovation funds.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Local School Innovation

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation:

\$9,970,064

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base:

\$9,970,064 0%

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06: *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding: *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

The program objective is to provide funds to districts and schools for developing innovative classroom practices to improve student and school performance. Maintenance of funding is needed to promote the improvement of student and school performance as measured by the school report card cards.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested:

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History:

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	20,888,245	20,888,245	9,970,064	9,970,064
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$20,888,245	\$20,888,245	\$9,970,064	\$9,970,064

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	19,896,944	18,612,938	9,970,064	9,970,064
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	990,514	1,731,018	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	787	544,289	0	0
TOTAL:	\$20,888,245	\$20,888,245	\$9,970,064	\$9,970,064
# FTES:				

FY 2003-04 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Modernize Vocational Equipment

Program Director: Dr. Bob Couch

Telephone: 803-734-8410

Fax: 803-734-3525

E-mail: jcouch@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What is the program mission statement and what were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003-04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed).*

Mission: To develop an integrated learning system that enables students to be successful in a global economy.

Objectives:

1. Continue a system to purchase state-of-the-art equipment for career and technology education programs. School districts/career centers will be required to indicate, on their local plan, the courses funded for equipment.
2. Percentage of career and technology education (CTE) students, identified by CIP code, achieving an average of at least 2.0 on final grades for the year for all career and technology courses taken will increase from 75.0% to 75.5%.

Formula: Numerator= The number of CIP coded students achieving a final grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 averaged over the year for all CTE courses.

Denominator= The total number of CIP coded students taking a CTE course(s).

3. Percentage of CTE completers who are available for placement and placed in postsecondary instruction, military service, or employment utilizing the career and technology competencies attained will be maintained at 93.5%. This percentage is calculated over a 3-year period of time.

Formula: Numerator= The number of CTE completers who are available for placement and placed in postsecondary instruction, military service, or employment utilizing the career and technology competencies attained. This percentage is calculated over a 3-year period of time.

Denominator= The number of CTE completers available for placement, averaged over a 3-year period.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003-04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.*

1. The total amount of funds (\$8,763,062) was distributed to all school districts based on the plan to expend funds submitted in each school district local plan. The total amount distributed reflected a 4.439% reduction in EIA funds and a 1.0% reduction in state funds imposed by the legislature.

2. The percentage of CTE students achieving an average of at least a 2.0 on final grade was 90.55%.
3. The percentage of CTE completers placed was 97.83%.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

1. Continue a system to purchase state-of-the-art equipment for career and technology education programs. School district/career centers will be required to indicate, on their local plan, the courses funded for equipment.
2. Percentage of career and technology education (CTE) students, identified by CIP code, achieving an average of at least 2.0 on final grades for the year for all career and technology courses taken will increase from 75.5% to 76.0%.

Formula: Numerator= The number of CIP coded students achieving a final grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 averaged over the year for all CTE courses.

Denominator= The total number of CIP coded students taking a CTE course(s).

3. Percentage of CTE completers who are available for placement and placed in postsecondary instruction, military service, or employment utilizing the career and technology competencies attained will be maintained at 93.5%. This percentage is calculated over a 3-year period of time.

Formula: Numerator= The number of CTE completers who are available for placement and placed in postsecondary instruction, military service, or employment utilizing the career and technology competencies attained. This percentage is calculated over a 3-year period of time.

Denominator= The number of CTE completers available for placement, averaged over a 3-year period.

The percentage for objective #2 increased by .5%.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05?

Data will be collected from all school districts and career centers to compile the percentages listed above.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05, will be met?

School districts/career centers that have not met the standards above will be required to develop an action plan, with assistance from the Office of Career and Technology Education, specifying activities that will be conducted to meet the standards.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: CATE Modernize Equipment

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$4,064,483

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$4,064,483

0% change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

This request is to maintain the current level of funding to purchase state-of-the-art equipment for career and technology education programs throughout the state.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$9,000,000	\$4,151,978	\$3,963,520	\$3,963,520
General Fund	0	\$4,848,022	\$4,739,548	\$4,739,548
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$8,703,068	\$8,703,068

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$8,703,036	\$8,763,062	\$8,703,068	\$8,703,068
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	296,964	236,938	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$8,703,068	\$8,703,068
# FTES:	*0	*0	*0	*0

*All funds are flow-through. No funds are retained for personnel.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: African-American History

Program Director: Willie Frazier

Telephone: 803-734-7751

Fax: 803-734-5953

E-mail: wfrazier@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Provide statewide assistance to teachers grades K–12 in the development and implementation of African-American history and multicultural curricula aligned with the state's standards for the purpose of increasing student learning.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

- a. Provide teachers with content information on the teaching of African-American History aligned with the social studies standards.
 - Monthly social studies updates included information from the African-American history and Multicultural Education Programs. This information is disseminated to the 85 school districts and other educators.
 - Provided thirteen grants to schools, districts, and other entities that provided professional development activities for teachers and other educators. More than 300 teachers were served with these grants.
 - In partnership with Bread Loaf School of English at Scott's Branch High School, Clarendon One, there was a school wide (491 students and 20 teachers) project that focused on the 50th year anniversary of Briggs v. Elliott. In addition, a national commission was involved during this historical anniversary.
- b. To increase teachers' knowledge and enhance their ability to use materials on African-American history and multicultural education.
 - Information and materials were shared with approximately 200 participants at a statewide conference held at Benedict College. Also, information was shared with approximately 300 participants at South Carolina Alliance of Black School Educators' (SCABSE) Conference.
 - Three school districts combined to train a total of 75 teachers during summer workshops.
 - Links were added to the Web page for teachers and educators with information such as the National Registry of Historic Places and the booklet Briggs v. Elliot.
- c. To assist schools, teachers, and students with recognizing the contribution and achievements of African-Americans and other ethnic populations, and to promote a climate that is sensitive to cultural diversity.

- In partnership with the South Carolina Association of School Administrators (SCASA) during their Summer Institute, assistance was provided for presenters to address these areas. Approximately 1,000 conference participants attended this event.
 - Also, in partnership with SCABSE, assistance was provided for presenters to the over 900 conference participants.
 - In partnership with the Columbia International Festival, approximately 5,000 students in grades 3–10 participated in the Global Education Day.
 - A calendar of National Cultural Observance is available on the Web to all teachers and schools.
- d. To promote a climate that is sensitive to cultural diversity and to insure that African-American history and multicultural education is infused into the school curriculum through textbooks and materials used in schools.
- Two school districts conducted sessions for 60 teachers during the summer on integrating African-American history and culture across the curriculum.
 - Cultural diversity has been emphasized to the committee members in the selection of textbooks and during the revision of the social studies standards.
 - More than 40 teachers and 15 school districts have requested information especially for the 50th anniversary of *Briggs v. Elliott* and the book *African-Americans and the Palmetto State*.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. To provide teachers with content information on the teaching of African-American history aligned with newly revised social studies standards;
- b. To increase teachers' knowledge and enhance their ability to use materials on African-American history and multicultural education;
- c. To assist schools, teachers, and students with recognizing the contributions and achievements of African-Americans and other ethnic populations, and promote a climate that is sensitive to cultural diversity; and
- d. To insure African-American history and multicultural education is infused into the school curriculum through textbooks and materials used in the schools.

Note: No changes were made from the previous year.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Objectives 1, 2, and 4: A survey of the district curriculum and social studies coordinators in the effectiveness of the newly revised social studies standards and the Educator Resource Guide.

Objective 3: Survey participants who are involved in training sessions and conferences including teachers who use the African-American history and multicultural education resources.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

- Include information in monthly social studies updates that meets the objectives.
- Provide grants to school districts for professional development opportunities that address the objectives.
- Support conferences such as SCABSE and SCASA in providing technical assistance and information that address the objectives.
- Continue to provide resources such as *African Americans and the Palmetto State* and the calendar of National Cultural Observances.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: African-American History

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$111,456 = includes three line items (Personal Service for \$55,246; Other Personal Service for \$5,697; and Other Operation Expense for \$50,513)

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The amount requested is \$111,456 (Personal Service for \$55,246; Other Personal Service for \$5,697; and Other Operating Expense for \$50,513), a 0% increase in funding over the 2004-05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to meet the program objectives of continuing to provide this service to schools:

- a. To provide teachers with content information on the teaching of African-American history aligned with newly revised social studies standards;
- b. To increase teachers' knowledge and enhance their ability to use materials on African-American history and multicultural education;
- c. To assist schools, teachers, and students with recognizing the contributions and achievements of African-Americans and other ethnic populations, and promote a climate that is sensitive to cultural diversity; and
- d. To insure African-American history and multicultural education is infused into the school curriculum through textbooks and materials used in the schools.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$55,246	\$55,246	\$55,246	\$55,246
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
Other Personal Service	5,697	5,697	5,697	5,697
Other Operating Expense	50,513	50,513	50,513	50,513
Carry Forward from Prior Year	60,880	53,262	55,482	0
TOTAL:	\$172,336	\$164,718	\$166,938	\$111,456

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$63,481	\$66,241	\$68,228	\$69,000
Supplies & Materials	4,875	3,694	6,559	2,456
Contractual Services	3,693	1,425	42,480	8,000
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	2,846	3,386	3,221	3,000
Travel	531	854	3,450	1,000
Allocations to Districts/Schools	5,000	34,939	30,000	22,000
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Other Entities	26,250	13,000	13,000	6,000
Budget Reduction	12,398	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	53,262	55,482	0	0
TOTAL:	\$172,336	\$179,021	\$166,938	\$111,456
# FTES:	1	1	1	1

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Institute of Reading

Program Director: Suzette S. Lee

Telephone: 803-734-6103

Fax: 803-734-6142

E-mail: slee@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? (*The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.*)

The program objective for Fiscal Year 2003–04 was to implement year 1 of the South Carolina Reading Initiative in the Middle Grades (SCRI-MG).

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. (*Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years."*)

In meeting this objective, we collaborated with the University of South Carolina (USC) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) to provide the first year of training to 34 literacy coaches from 26 districts and 45 middle schools from August 2003–June 2004 via 3 graduate courses in language and literacy taught 2–3 days per month August–May and 3 weeks in June. During year 1 of the initiative, literacy coaches remained in the classroom so that they could try out best practice with students in anticipation of sharing these practices with other classroom teachers in years 2–4. They did begin informal literacy conversations around professional readings in January 2004 with interested teachers. These informal book clubs served as the precursor to formal study groups, which began in August 2004. Two instructors from USC, 1 SDE liaison, and 5 regional literacy coaches supported the SCRI-MG literacy coaches via web-based communication, monthly study, regional meetings, and on-site technical assistance.

Throughout the year, we collected a variety of anecdotal and quantifiable data to determine the effectiveness of SCRI-MG. First, after each professional development session, we collected exit slips to evaluate the effectiveness of the training. Instructors used this feedback, to modify both course content and practice. In addition to this anecdotal data, we administered a survey in August 2004, the end of year 1 of the initiative, to determine literacy coach ratings on the effectiveness of SCRI-MG. The following tables summarize the data collected on survey:

Table 1
Coaches' Title (N=39)

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Regional Coach	5	13.0
School-based Coach	34	87.0

Total 39 100.0

Table 2

Effectiveness Ratings of the SCRI Components of SCRI-MG over the One-Year Time Period (N=39)

Aspects	N	Mean
Training	30	4.80
Mentoring	30	5.00
Teaching team	30	4.70
SDE liaisons	30	4.90
Regional coaches	30	4.96
Materials	30	5.00
Impact	30	4.90
Overall effectiveness	30	4.90

Note. Respondents indicate how effective each of the above aspects is using the five-point rating scale: 1=Highly ineffective; 2=Ineffective; 3=Okay, no particular concerns; 4=Effective; 5=Highly effective.

Table 3

Effectiveness Ratings for the SCRI Components of SCRI-MG (N=39)

Category	N	Mean
Use of professional literature to enhance your growth	30	3.96
SCRI instructional materials	30	3.93
Impact of SCRI on your school	30	3.57
Overall impact of SCRI on the schools with which you work	30	3.66
**Prior to SCRI, your ability to confidently articulate a rationale for your instructional practices in language arts	30	2.73
Your current ability to confidently articulate a rationale for your instructional practices in language arts	30	3.86
**Prior to SCRI, your ability to confidently talk about the authors of articles and books you have read and how they have helped you	30	2.70
Your current ability to confidently talk about the authors of articles and books you have read and how they have helped you	30	3.80

Note. Participants indicate how effective each of the above areas is using the four-point rating scale: 1=Ineffective; 2=Sometimes effective; 3=Effective; 4=Highly effective.

Table 4

Consistency Ratings of Coaches' Practices and Beliefs with SCRI Practices and Beliefs across the Year (N=39)

Category	N	Mean
<i>Practices</i>		
Prior to SCRI	27	2.77
Year 1	29	3.75
<i>Beliefs</i>		
Prior to SCRI	27	3.00
Year 1	29	3.86

Note. Participants indicate the degree of consistency of their practices and beliefs with SCRI practices and beliefs for each of the above years using the four-point rating scale: 1=Not at all consistent; 2=Rarely consistent; 3=Somewhat consistent; 4=Highly consistent.

Table 5

Category	N	Mean
Knowledge of theory	30	3.83
Knowledge about instructional practices that support literacy	30	3.93
Ability to articulate theory behind my practice	30	3.70
Ability to meet the needs of a diverse group of readers	30	3.86
Ability to meet the needs of a diverse group of writers	30	3.76
Ability to use assessment to inform instruction	30	3.53
Ability to take a miscue or running record	30	3.46
Ability to interpret a miscue or running record	30	3.36
Ability to use the information from miscues or running records to make instructional decisions	30	3.36
Ability to help readers become more strategic	30	3.83
Ability to help children develop as writers	30	3.83
Ability to critically and regularly analyze my practice	29	3.89
Ability to meet state ELA standards with practices learned in SCRI	29	3.89

Note. Respondents indicate the extent of increase in their knowledge, ability, or enthusiasm as a result of SCRI for each of the above categories using the four-point rating scale: 1=Stayed the same; 2=Slight increase; 3=Increase; 4=Great increase.

A preliminary analysis of this quantitative data reveals the following findings about the effectiveness of the year 1 implementation of SCRI-MG:

- Mentoring and materials received the highest mean rating ($M=5.0$) for SCRI-MG effectiveness followed closely by regional literacy coaches ($M=4.96$), with the initiative receiving an overall effectiveness rating of 4.9 out of a possible 5.
- Because of SCRI-MG, literacy coaches are the most confident in their use of professional literature to enhance their growth ($M=3.96$).
- Literacy coaches' practices and beliefs became more consistent with SCRI-MG beliefs and practices over the one-year period.
- They indicated having the highest increase ($M=3.93$) in their knowledge about instructional practices that support literacy.

The SCRI Reading Profile data from the 2003–04 school year has been statistically analyzed for measuring teacher change in the theory and practice of literacy learning. The Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 data were merged so that the means could be compared using a paired samples t-test. Over the course of one year, the data from SCRI-MG revealed a significant difference between fall and spring in the following 6 clusters: read aloud, use of multiple cues, use of textbooks, skill and strategy instruction, matching texts to readers, and instructional groups. In the other 11 areas, they also became more consistent with SCRI; the differences were simply not statistically significant. In conclusion, there was growth across all areas, which mean practical significance in all 17 and statistical in 6 of the 17.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2003-04? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objective for the current fiscal year is to implement year 1 of the SCRI-MG initiative. The reduction in program objectives is directly related to the decrease in funding for the Institute of Reading from over \$3.2 million in 2002–03 to \$1.3 million in 2003–04.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2003-04?

Both an end-of-the-year survey and the SCRI Reading Profile will be used to assess the effectiveness of SCRI-MG during the Fiscal Year 2003–04.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2003-04, will be met?

The SDE staff, USC faculty, and Regional Literacy Coaches will monitor the implementation of SCRI-MG and provide on-site technical assistance to assure that program objectives for FY2003–04 are met.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Institute of Reading

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$1,312,874

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$2,962,874
125.68 percent increase

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

The requested increase is \$1,650,000.00 or 125.68 percent more than the current funding level of \$1,312,874.00. This amount is calculated based on the costs of implementing the first year of the South Carolina Reading Initiative at the high school level (SCRI-HS). This funding would enable the SDE to award 25 \$50,000 competitive grants for a total of \$1,250,000.00 to districts across the state for the support of 25 high school literacy coaches and \$400,000.00 to pay for the training of the coaches, including instruction, materials, and other training costs.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

The program objectives for Fiscal Year 2005–06 would be

- To implement year 3 of the South Carolina Reading Initiative in the middle grades (SCRI-MG),
- To implement year 1 of the South Carolina Reading Initiative at the high school level (SCRI-HS).

The maintenance of funding for the Institute of Reading would enable the SDE to continue the implementation of SCRI-MG, while the increase in funding would allow us to expand the initiative by training the first cohort of high school literacy coaches via SCRI-HS, thereby adding an objective to the one for the current year. Since the inception of SCRI in 2000–01, the high schools have clamored for this type of ongoing, inquiry-based professional development for their teachers. If the high schools are to succeed with both state and national assessments such as the English 1 End-of-Course test, HSAP, and the New SAT, teachers need intensive professional development in best practices in the teaching of reading and writing for adolescents. SCRI is poised to provide this professional development; however, we cannot do so without this funding increase.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	3,085,763	\$1,312,874	\$1,312,874	\$2,962,874
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	795,411	777,312	506,890	0
TOTAL:	\$3,881,174	\$2,090,186	\$1,819,764	\$2,962,874

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	227,168	52,689	33,000	\$33,000
Supplies & Materials	163,633	91,044	180,869	179,049
Contractual Services	533,502	115,017	122,552	165,000
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	35,399	17,698	15,000	15,000
Travel	15,411	10,380	36,814	35,000
Allocations to Districts/Schools	1,788,946	1,167,362	1,205,360	2,415,000
Employer Contributions	2,639	570	825	825
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Other Entities	202,990	4,000	50,000	5,000
Allocations to Other Agencies	134,174	71,794	80,360	115,000
Budget Reduction	0	52,742	0	
Balance Remaining	777,312	506,890	94,984	0
TOTAL:	\$3,881,174	\$2,090,186	\$1,819,764	\$2,962,874
# FTES:	*4	**3	**3	**3

* Program funds supported three positions and fringe. An additional FTE plus fringe (30%) was paid for with SDE operating funds (\$86,000).

** Program funds supported one position and fringe. Two additional FTEs plus fringe (30%) were paid for with SDE operating funds (\$175,981).

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Grant Program

Program Director: James Bryan

Telephone: 803-734-0322

Fax: 803-734-5953

E-mail: jrbryan@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- a. Districts participating in the program will increase from 90 percent to 100 percent over the next three years by offering priority consideration for technical assistance in grant writing to districts not participating in the program.
- b. Applications addressing curriculum standards will increase to 100 percent over the next three years.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

For the 2003–04 school year, a total of 383 grants were awarded out of 726 applications. Grant awards ranged from \$2,000 to \$6,000 for a total of \$1.272 million dollars. According to year-end reports, these grants impacted more than 2,739 teachers/administrators and 53,491 students.

Objective 1. During the period 2000–04, all districts have had one or more teachers receive a grant. At least one teacher from 78 of the 85 districts submitted a proposal for the 2003–04 school year.

Objective 2. Section two of the grant selection criteria was reworded and received additional weighting. The changes require every application to accurately identify the selected curriculum standards and explain how the project objectives address them. All funded projects address the curriculum standards.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objective (1) Develop tools to simplify the grant application process for teachers.

Objective (2) Maintain the number of districts with at least one teacher submitting an application.

Objective (3) Maintain the 100 percent level of grants focusing on curriculum standards.

Objective (4) Expand the links among teachers to share innovative practices and results from funded projects.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

- a. The number of teachers/district EIA contacts persons/grant readers responding to survey questions regarding the application process and support documents.
- b. List of teachers submitting applications displayed by district.
- c. Copy of the grant selection criteria indicating weighting placed on curriculum standards and requirement to disseminate information.
- d. The number of funded grants that address specific curriculum standards.
- e. The number of teachers who submit lesson plans or other results for statewide distribution.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

- a. Ongoing electronic assistance provided through Web-based information, on-line support and newsletters.
- b. Make the application process as easy as possible within policy guidelines and change the final report format from paper to electronic submission.
- c. Continue to provide instructions to professional teacher groups on the grant process.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Teacher Grant Program

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$1,287,044

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The total amount requested is \$1,287,044, a 0% increase over the 2004–05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is requested in order to meet the current objectives and expand on those:

Objective (1) Develop tools to simplify the grant application process for teachers.

Objective (2) Increase the number of districts with at least one teacher submitting an application.

Objective (3) Maintain the 100 percent level of grants focusing on curriculum standards.

Objective (4) Expand the links among teachers to share innovative practices and results from funded projects.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$1,348,241	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,348,241	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools*	\$1,325,291	\$1,275,343	1,272,166	1,287,044
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	21,027	61,197	0	0
Balance Remaining	1,923	11,701	14,878	0
TOTAL:	\$1,348,241	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044
# FTES:	** .30	** .30	** .30	** .30

* Reference FY2003-04 amount of \$1,275,343. All funds were not awarded (\$72,898) due to scoring ranges. In other words, if 20 grants scored 62 points, it was impossible to fund only a portion of the grants that received equal scores.

** Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for .30 of an FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$23,500) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Act 135-Early Child Development and Academic Assistance

Program Director: Mellanie Jinnette

Telephone: 803-734-3605

Fax: 803-734-8574

E-mail: mjinnett@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of this program is to provide targeted assistance for under performing students in order to improve academic performance. Provide for reading recovery to improve reading skills in early grades (contained in a separate report). Provide services to adult education students scoring below BSAP standard on any portion of the exit exam. Primary objective measure is a reduction in student PACT scores below basic.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Fiscal Year 2003-04 objectives were met in part.

Effectiveness Measures: The number of student scores below basic on the PACT:

2001: 185,365
2002: 164,354
2003: 178,178
2004:

Summary of Spring 2004 PACT results:

In nearly all grades tested in 2004, results were up for students scoring Proficient or above.

Grade 3

English/Language Arts – 86 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 82 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 83 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 82 percent in 2003

Science – 60 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 56 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 72 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 61 percent in 2003

Grade 4

English/Language Arts – 81 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 56 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 80 percent met the standards in 2004, down from 81 percent in 2003

Science – 62 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 57 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 71 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 65 percent in 2003

Grade 5

English/Language Arts – 77 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 68 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 76 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 75 percent in 2003

Science – 60 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 58 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 64 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 60 percent in 2003

Grade 6

English/Language Arts – 64 percent met the standards in 2004, down from 66 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 77 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 76 percent in 2003

Science – 54 percent met the standards in 2004, down from 58 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 65 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 60 percent in 2003

Grade 7

English/Language Arts – 72 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 70 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 72 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 79 percent in 2003

Science – 63 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 59 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 60 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 59 percent in 2003

Grade 8

English/Language Arts – 73 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 67 percent in 2003

Mathematics – 68 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 67 percent in 2003

Science – 59 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 57 percent in 2003

Social Studies – 65 percent met the standards in 2004, up from 61 percent in 2003

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Primary objective measure is a reduction in student PACT scores below basic.

Objectives have not changed for FY 2004-05.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

PACT scores

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Districts must provide appropriate services and expend funds in accordance with the Funding Manual given the FY 2005 flexibility initiative for districts.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Act 135-Early Child Development and Academic Assistance

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

The base appropriation for FY 2004-2005 is \$120,352,806 which includes \$3,200,000 of Reading Recovery which is included in a separate report.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

No increase is requested.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

FY 2005 appropriation amount is required to maintain the same level of service in FY 2006.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

No FTEs are requested

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$120,412,397	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,352,806
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$120,412,397	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,352,806

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$116,037,581	\$114,516,506	\$120,352,806	\$120,352,806
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	4,144,507	5,895,891	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	230,309	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$120,412,397	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,352,806
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: ACT 135-Academic Assistance (Reading Recovery)/Aid to Other State Agencies (Reading Recovery)

Program Director: Pam Huxford

Telephone: 803-734-8825

Fax: 803-734-6142

E-mail: puxford@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective of Reading Recovery is to provide an effective short-term early intervention through one-on-one tutoring for low-achieving first graders. The intervention is most effective when it is available to all students who need it and is used as a supplement to good classroom teaching. In Reading Recovery, individual students receive a half-hour lesson each school day for twelve to twenty weeks with a specially trained Reading Recovery teacher. As soon as students can read within the average range of their class and demonstrate that they can continue to achieve, their lessons are discontinued, and new students begin individual instruction.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

During 2002–03 (this is the most current data available) data was collected from each school district, which chose to implement Reading Recovery. This data was collected by Reading Recovery teacher leaders and was submitted to the South Carolina Department of Education, Clemson University that serves as the Reading Recovery training site, and the National Data Evaluation Center. The data reported that forty-two school districts now participate in Reading Recovery and that 253 schools have Reading Recovery in their building. During this reporting period, 4,198 students were served in Reading Recovery statewide and 81 percent of those students that received a full program (3,267) could read at the average level of their classmates (discontinuation rate). In addition, nineteen new Reading Recovery teachers were trained statewide in the Reading Recovery model. Of the forty school districts with Reading Recovery programs, seven sites (districts) were fully implementing Reading Recovery. This is an approximately 5 percent decrease from 2000–2001, due to budget restrictions. The number of children who are referred to special programs for additional literacy help is almost non-existent (less than 1 percent). Children who are successful in the program are unlikely to be retained or to be placed in special education for reading and writing services. Because Reading Recovery is committed to serving the neediest children first, the intervention ensures that no child will be left behind.

Clemson University is the training site for Reading Recovery® in South Carolina. Established in 1989, the Clemson University Training Center coordinates training and professional development for South Carolina's Reading Recovery teachers and leaders. The Training Center also works in collaboration with the S.C. Department of Education to continue effective statewide implementation of the program.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objectives for the 2003–04 school year have not changed from the prior year. The program objectives are to increase Reading Recovery services as an intervention for first grade students at risk of not learning to read and write by conventional methods, to provide funding to increase the number of Reading Recovery teachers for training and on-going professional development for new and existing Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leaders, and to monitor the implementation of Reading Recovery in South Carolina and increase the number of students that are successful as defined by the Reading Recovery Council of North America.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Data for the annual Reading Recovery program evaluation were gathered from the following sources:

Reading Recovery Student Data Form

Reading Recovery teachers used Parts 1 and 2 of the National Student Data Form to record student background information, the scores from *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a), which served as pretest and posttest literacy measures, and other year-end information on all Reading Recovery children. This form was used for all Random Sample children as well.

Reading Recovery Teacher and Teacher Leader Data Form

The National Teacher Data Form provided background information on Reading Recovery teachers and Teacher Leaders (trained or in-training, years of experience in education and in Reading Recovery, number of assigned teaching slots, etc.). This form also yielded information about the schools that participated in Reading Recovery (locale, funding sources, number of years in Reading Recovery, level of coverage, etc.).

Literacy Measures

The six tasks in Clay's (1993a) *An Observation of Early Literacy Achievement* were used as pretest and posttest measures. The Survey tasks have the qualities of sound assessment instruments with reliabilities and validities.

All six tasks of the *Observation Survey* were administered to Reading Recovery students in the fall (start of the school year) and/or at entry to the intervention. These scores serve as pretest measures in the evaluation design. The six tasks were also administered to Reading Recovery students upon discontinuing or exiting from the program. In the spring (end of school year), the six tasks were again administered to all students who received Reading Recovery services during the year. Spring scores served as the posttest measures in comparing the progress made by Reading Recovery children in the various end-of-program status groups to each other, and to children in the random sample.

Random Sample children were tested in the fall using all six measures of the *Observation Survey*. They were given all six measures in the spring at the end of the school year in order to create an average band of performance for each of the Survey tasks. This average band was then used to compare scores of the Reading Recovery children to their classroom peers.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The State Department of Education will continue to monitor Reading Recovery statewide as well as Clemson University Training Center. Reading Recovery teachers will:

- teach at least four first-grade children per day individually for thirty minute daily sessions in a school setting throughout the school year.
- keep complete records on each child as a basis for instruction (observation survey and summary, predictions of progress, lesson records, running records, record of writing vocabulary, record of book level).
- demonstrate effective teaching of Reading Recovery
- administer Observation Survey as appropriate throughout the year.
- communicate with parents, first-grade teachers, and other appropriate school personnel throughout the year
- submit data to the teacher leader as required
- contribute to the development and operation of a school team to monitor program progress
- monitor the progress of children whose programs have been discontinued
- prepare an annual report of the school Reading Recovery program
- work toward full coverage at the school level
- consult with the teacher leader about children not making satisfactory progress and other program issues
- attend a minimum of six continuing contact sessions each year, including a minimum of four behind-the-glass sessions with two lessons each session
- teach a child behind the glass for colleagues as scheduled
- receive at least one school visit from a teacher leader annually

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: ACT 135-Academic Assistance (Reading Recovery)/Aid to Other State Agencies (Reading Recovery)

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation is \$3,200,000 plus aid to state agencies for training is \$163,147.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The requested amount is \$3,200,000 plus aid to state agencies for training is \$163,147, a 0% increase from the 2004–05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to meet program objectives by providing resources to schools and teachers. The program objectives are to increase Reading Recovery services as an intervention for first grade students at risk of not learning to read and write by conventional methods, to provide funding to increase the number of Reading Recovery teachers for training and on-going professional development for new and existing Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leaders, and to monitor the implementation of Reading Recovery in South Carolina and increase the number of students that are successful as defined by the Reading Recovery Council of North America.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
Aid to State Agencies (Clemson University RR Training Site)	170,904	163,147	163,147	163,147
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,370,904	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service				
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Aid to State Agencies (Clemson University RR Training Site)	167,561	163,147	163,147	163,147
Balance Remaining	3,343	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,370,904	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147
# FTES:	*.5	*.5	*.5	*.5

* Budget figures to not include salary and fringes (30%) for .50 of an FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$39,800) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Half-Day 4K Programs

Program Director: Linda C. Mims

Telephone: 803-734-9052

Fax: 803-734-9052

E-mail: lmims@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- 1) To provide comprehensive, quality training and technical assistance to school district 4K and 5K teachers in the implementation of developmentally appropriate classroom practices and increase the quality of early childhood programs.
- 2) To collaborate with the Office of Curriculum and Standards to implement 4K and 5K early literacy and family literacy models in the 32 schools receiving the Reading Excellence Act grant awards (SC READS).
- 3) To continue collaboration with the Office of First Steps, Head Start, and other state initiatives that target young children and their families.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.) Yes – see below*

Training was delivered to 4K and 5K teachers in the implementation of developmentally appropriate classroom practices and the quality of early childhood programs was increased according to the following data:

Type of Training	Numbers of Participants	Percentages of Favorable Reviews	Requests for Additional Help	Number of Administrators Trained
On site training to 4K and 5K teachers (visiting classrooms and meeting with teachers for additional training at other times)	According to monthly reports, 3,976 teachers, administrators, as well as representatives from private programs and Head Start were trained during 2003 – 2004	95%	138	92

Distant ed. training delivered to teachers	Unknown as to how many teachers and administrators received training this way – this vehicle of training is just beginning to be used for early childhood education. Early Childhood distance education was used for 3 different broadcasts during the year and was delivered statewide			
High/Scope	120	95%	49	15
Montessori	35	98%	35	3
Creative Curriculum	89	95%	29	6
Emails and questions relative to particular needs by particular teachers	3,687	n/a		387

There was an increase in teacher training delivered to districts and to other providers by 5% over the preceding year, based upon monthly report training activity; some of the training is beginning to shift towards distance education rather than individual school by school training. There was also an increase by 5% in the numbers of Head Start and private childcare providers and DSS trainers who participated in training offered through SDE OECE.

During 2004 – 2005, literacy coach meetings and training continued in all 32 SC READS schools. (see report from Reading Initiative (Suzette Lee) for specific literacy training details in the SC READS schools).

Continued collaboration with First Steps:

- 1) First Steps is now funding deliverable services during this current year to be performed by SDE staff in return for salaried positions in the OECE/ monthly reports compile the intensity and nature of the deliverable services
- 2) Joint work with First Steps on Count Down to Kindergarten; 60 teachers served 600 children with intensive, summer home visitation activities; activities were designed by FS and OECE staff to enable parents to teach beginning kindergarten skills to their children/almost ½ of the summer teachers are those who will work with the children throughout the 2004 – 2005 school year
- 3) OECE provided \$50,000 of SC READS funding for Countdown and \$5,000 of Even Start funding for Countdown – Even Start strategy was for teachers to solicit families who are potential Even Start participants
- 4) Beginning work by both staff units on refinement of office tasks – dividing into two content teams: family literacy and early childhood
- 5) Working w/ First Steps and DSS on ECERS reviews of 23 primary schools
- 6) Shared planning and training for 4 different events: strategic planning, regular office meetings, family literacy training, early childhood training

- 7) Shared planning and work on lottery strategies to ensure that additional 4K slots are provided and additional family literacy programs are funded

Continued collaboration with Head Start:

- 1) Head Start is invited to every training event held during 2003 – 2004/387 Head Start teachers and administrators participated
- 2) Head Start participated in all Palmetto Stars matrix development projects – jointly with DSS and SDE; 6 different meetings were held to develop the flow of the Palmetto Stars from Level 1 – Level 5
- 3) Head Start directors serve on several committees developed by OECE: early childhood advisory committee, Palmetto Stars, Good Start/Grow Smart, and family literacy consortium
- 4) Head Start is targeted as a program where children will be served at USC – GATEWAY Child Care and Research Center – no children have yet to be served in this center from Head Start. This request will continue until it works.

Continued collaboration with DSS:

- 1) DSS participates with SDE on the First Steps Lottery Strategies
- 2) DSS continues to provide vouchers to the OECE for teen mothers who are served in family literacy programs
- 3) DSS continues to meet regularly with SDE and First Steps and USC – GATEWAY staff to further ensure the collaborative development of quality in the Center
- 4) DSS has ceased funding to the OECE for administration of the family literacy teen parent vouchers; this funding provision will be re-evaluated for FY 2006
- 5) DSS continues to meet on the state Good Start/Grow Smart Task Force which is chaired by OECE
- 6) DSS continues to lead the Childcare Coordinating Council – regular meetings and reports assure that the strategies defined in the State Childcare Strategic Plan are met

**ECERS Reports for Year One of Use to Determine Program Quality in Primary Schools
Comparison to SCRA Scores**

Name of School	Average School ECERS Score (4-5: acceptable)	(District Percentages) % Language Arts – SCRA – consistently demonstrates	(District Percentages) % Math/SCRA consistently demonstrates	(District Percentages) % Social/Emotional SCRA consistently demonstrates)
	4.68	80%-communication 79%-early reading 84% -writing	74%- mathematical processes 82%-number and operations 87%-patterns, relationships, and functions 89%-geometry and spacial relations 81%-measurement 83%-data collection and probability	77%-self concept 87%-self control 81%-approaches to learning 88%-interaction with others 88%-social problem-solving

Primary School #2	2.32	64%-communication 63%-early reading 72%-writing	54%-mathematical processes 63%-number and operations 69%-patterns,relationships, and functions 68%-geometry and spatial relations 68%-measurement 49%-data collection and probability	59%-self concept 79%-self control 62%-approaches to learning 80%-interaction with others 68%-social problem-solving
Primary School #3	4.03	52%-communication 57%-early reading 51%-writing	35%-mathematical processes 58%-number and operations 55%-patterns, relationships, and functions 48%-geometry and spatial relations 35%-measurement 26%-data collection and probability	46%-self concept 68%-self control 48%-approaches to learning 61%-interaction with others 57%-social problem-solving
Primary School #4	5.49	67%-communication 74%-early reading 80%-writing	60%-mathematical processes, 77%-number and operations, 84%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 76%-geometry and spatial relations, 72%-measurement, 66%-data collection and probability,	64%-self concept, 80%-self control, 73%-approaches to learning, 81%-interaction with others, 74%-social problem-solving
Primary School #5	4.14	65%-communication, 67%-early reading, 71%-writing	53%-mathematical processes, 69%-number and operations, 76%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 72%-geometry and spatial relations, 60%-measurement, 54%-data collection and probability	61%-self concept, 76%-self control, 61%-approaches to learning, 77%-interaction with others, 73%-social problem-solving

Primary School #6	6.02	80%-communication, 69%-early reading, 84%-writing	74%-mathematical processes, 82%-number and operations, 87%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 89%-geometry and spatial relations, 81%-measurement, 83%-data collection and probability	77%-self concept, 87%-self control, 81%-approaches to learning, 88%-interaction with others, 88%-social problem-solving
Primary School *7	5.13	76%-communication, 79%-early reading, 87%-writing	69%-mathematical processes, 85%-number and operations, 85%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 82%-geometry and spatial relations, 76%-measurement, 78%-data collection and probability	63%-self concept, 86%-self control, 71%-approaches to learning, 82%-interaction with others, 81%-social problem-solving
Primary School #8	2.79	71%-communication, 80%-early reading, 82%-writing	55%-mathematical processes, 78%-number and operations, 76%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 78%-geometry and spatial relations, 68%-measurement, 49%-data collection and probability	71%-self concept, 82%-self control, 69%-approaches to learning, 88%-interaction with others, 82%-social problem-solving
Primary School #9	5.55	72%-communication, 69%-early reading, 81%-writing	51%-mathematical processes, 75%-number and operations, 78%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 79%-geometry and spatial relations, 68%-measurement, 72%-data collection and probability	64%-self concept, 83%-self control, 73%-approaches to learning, 80%-interaction with others, 80%-social problem-solving

Primary School #10	5.53	80%-communication, 79%-early reading, 84%-writing	74%-mathematical processes, 82%-number and operations, 87%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 89%-geometry and spatial relations, 81%-measurement, 83%-data collection and probability	77%-self concept, 87%-self control, 81%-approaches to learning, 88%-interaction with others, 88%-social problem-solving
Primary School #11	4.06	80%-communication, 79%-early reading, 84%-writing	74%-mathematical processes, 82%-number and operations, 87%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 89%-geometry and spatial relations, 81%-measurement, 83%-data collection and probability	77%-self concept, 87%-self control, 81%-approaches to learning, 88%-interaction with others, 88%-social problem-solving
Primary School #12	4.80	67%-communication, 84%-early reading, 80%-writing	60%-mathematical processes, 77%-number and operations, 84%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 76%-geometry and spatial relations, 72%-measurement, 66%-data collection and probability	64%-self concept, 80%-self control, 73%-approaches to learning, 81%-interaction with others, 74%-social problem-solving
Primary School #13	4.30	63%-communication, 62%-early reading, 71%-writing	58%-mathematical processes, 68%-number and operations, 73%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 70%-geometry and spatial relations, 68%-measurement, 57%-data collection and probability	52%-self concept, 79%-self control, 61%-approaches to learning, 75%-interaction with others, 61%-social problem-solving

Primary School #14	4.71	69%-communication, 68%-early reading, 71%-writing	62%-mathematical processes, 76%-number and operations, 79%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 75%-geometry and spatial relations, 62%-measurement, 60%-data collection and probability	66%-self concept, 78%-self control, 66%-approaches to learning, 78%-interaction with others, 78%-social problem-solving
Primary School #15	2.47	70%-communication, 82%-early reading, 89%-writing	66%-mathematical processes, 81%-number and operations, 83%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 82%-geometry and spatial relations, 79%-measurement, 72%-data collection and probability	63%-self concept, 81%-self control, 71%-approaches to learning, 85%-interaction with others, 79%-social problem-solving
Primary School #16	4.61	72%-communication, 74%-early reading, 80%-writing	64%-mathematical processes, 73%-number and operations, 80%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 77%-geometry and spatial relations, 71%-measurement, 64%-data collection and probability	73%-self concept, 86%-self control, 71%-approaches to learning, 82%-interaction with others, 81%-social problem-solving
Primary School #17	4.72	58%-communication, 56%-early reading, 65%-writing	42%-mathematical processes, 53%-number and operations, 61%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 56%-geometry and spatial relations, 51%-measurement, 39%-data collection and probability	39%-self concept, 73%-self control, 63%-approaches to learning, 71%-interaction with others, 65%-social problem-solving

Primary School #18	2.00	70%-communication, 82%-early reading, 89%-writing	66%-mathematical processes, 81%-number and operations, 83%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 82%-geometry and spatial relations, 79%-measurement, 72%-data collection and probability	63%-self concept, 81%-self control, 71%-approaches to learning, 85%-interaction with others, 79%-social problem-solving
Primary School #19	4.59	61%-communication, 64%-early reading, 67%-writing	41%-mathematical processes, 64%-number and operations, 74%-patterns, relationships, and functions, 66%-geometry and spatial relations, 52%-measurement, 39%-data collection and probability	57%-self concept, 71%-self control, 59%-approaches to learning, 76%-interaction with others, 70%-social problem-solving
Primary School #20	5.01	67%-communication, 74%-early reading, 80%-writing	60%-mathematical processes, 77%-number and operations, 84%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 76%-geometry and spatial relations, 72%-measurement, 66%-data collection and probability,	64%-self concept, 80%-self control, 73%-approaches to learning, 81%-interaction with others, 74%-social problem-solving
Primary School #21	2.87	51%-communication, 55%-early reading, 65%-writing	49%-mathematical processes, 57%-number and operations, 63%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 64%-geometry and spatial relations, 62%-measurement, 57%-data collection and probability,	51%-self concept, 84%-self control, 52%-approaches to learning, 76%-interaction with others, 70%-social problem-solving

Primary School #22	4.74	55%-communication 53%-early reading 58%-writing	37%-mathematical processes, 53%-number and operations, 55%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 55%-geometry and spatial relations, 47%-measurement, 48%-data collection and probability,	52%-self concept, 63%-self control, 51%-approaches to learning, 62%-interaction with others, 53%-social problem-solving
Primary School #23	4.96	51%-communication 55%-early reading 81%-writing	51%-mathematical processes, 75%-number and operations, 78%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 69%-geometry and spatial relations, 68%-measurement, 72%-data collection and probability,	64%-self concept, 83%-self control, 73%-approaches to learning, 80%-interaction with others, 80%-social problem-solving
Primary School #24	5.06	76%-communication 66%-early reading 83%-writing	67%-mathematical processes, 72%-number and operations, 81%-Patterns, relationships, and functions, 81%-geometry and spatial relations, 77%-measurement, 83%-data collection and probability,	78%-self concept, 81%-self control, 77%-approaches to learning, 87%-interaction with others, 85%-social problem-solving

Preliminary review of the above data indicates that higher SCRA scores are slightly more confined to schools which received higher ECERS scores. Programs that scored very high or very low on either tool have indicated through informal survey that they tended to concentrate on one tool or the other, without looking at how they should integrate. This judgment is speculative at this point; therefore further examination of the phenomena will be conducted during 2004 – 2005 by national reviews of 4K programs in our state; one by SERVE – UNCG and the other by National Institute of Early Education Research, NIEER, Rutgers University.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- 1) Results for the NIEER study (National Institute of Early Education Research) and the SERVE study will give needed impetus to the development of 4K programs in the state and the use of ECERS to define quality in those programs. Children’s progress and the quality of the use of ECERS in the state will be defined with specific results of program quality and individual child progress.
- 2) The use of South Carolina Readiness Assessment (SCRA) will be improved by increasing the number of training initiatives by 10%, increasing the reliability of data gained by assuring that similar understanding of progress is occurring will be determined by teacher/administrator

interviews (increase of confidence of 5%), and improving the materials and computer-based support for SCRA and SCRAPI (by 5% more incidences of helpful information for teachers).

- 3) The use of ECERS will increase from 23 schools in 2004 to 55 schools in 2005; ECERS scores will be aligned to student performance on SCRA.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Objective 1: Data will be distributed from both the NIEER study and the SERVE study on the quality and effectiveness of the 4K programs the use of ECERS to determine quality in those programs.

Objective 2: SCRA scores will be scrutinized as well as the number of training events, the number of participants, interviews of training participants, number of training material produced for teacher consumption, alignment of SCRA scores with PACT scores and ECERS scores across the state.

Objective 3: ECERS reports on individual scores will be produced although school identify will be confidential; state staff development plans will be produced that rely on the ECERS scores as well as SCRA scores. Training reports will be maintained as well as documents showing the level of training and support by administrators for teachers in schools being reviewed by ECERS.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

- 1) Monthly review of SCRA information and documentation (track all SCRA initiatives and review all state reported data)
- 2) Monthly review of individual staff reports concerning training and professional development activities
- 3) Monthly meetings with the staff of NIEER and SERVE throughout the life of those external studies.
- 4) Publication of official documents when the NIEER and SERVE projects end.
- 5) Monthly meetings with Dr. Diane Willis who is compiling an "Early Childhood Achievement Gap Report" that will show areas of the state and populations of the state who are falling into the gap of poorly delivered early childhood services
- 6) Monthly meetings with Susan Graham, new director of USC – GATEWAY, to ensure the development of that center as staff work towards accreditation and the center can become the "early childhood model" that OECE needs to show trainees.
- 7) Monthly meetings with Cody Carlton, ECERS coordinator, to track the progress of the use of ECERS in the state. (how many reviews are made and the results of those reviews)
- 8) Monthly meetings with Robin Snipes, Palmetto Stars Process Coordinator, to keep the progress of the office on track as OECE works collaboratively with DSS to roll-out Palmetto Stars on a statewide basis.
- 9) Monthly meetings with Ruth Nodine to ensure that teen parents are receiving DSS vouchers to the extent that this project will allow.
- 10) Monthly meetings with Estella Holliday to review the numbers of families who are extended family literacy services through Even Start, ACT 135, and the developing family literacy project with First Steps
- 11) Monthly meetings with Harriette Jenerette to document progress towards a stronger relationship with Head Start (number of meetings, results of meetings, documentation of collaborative efforts between Head Start and school districts) as well as review reports of the family literacy consortium (numbers of persons attended, tasks of participants, completion of individual participant tasks, effects of those tasks on service recipients)
- 12) Review numbers of early childhood certified teachers in public school programs, private programs, and Head Start programs – compare annually to see increase of 3% - greater level of education of teachers should lead to increased quality of programs as determined by ECERS and increase student performance by children as determined by SCRA and tracking of 4K children to 3rd grade PACT.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Half-Day 4K Programs

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$21,832,678

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$32,132,678
47% increase

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

Approximately 18,000 four year old children are served in school district 4K programs. Waiting lists in the districts show 38000 children who did not get into 4K programs during 2003 – 2004. During summer, fall 2004, 149 parents and grandparents contacted the Office of Early Childhood Education, upset that their young children/grandchildren could not be admitted to district 4K programs. Districts do not have space to serve all 54,000 four year old children but they do have ability to serve the children in high quality programs, taught by early childhood certified teachers. Where space is not present, according to the 4K regulations, programs may be housed in private sites and Head Start sites as long as specific determiners of quality exist. "The Penny Report" released in December, 2002 show that lower income children from literacy poor homes perform as well as or better than their more affluent peers when they have been in public school 4K programs when they reach 3rd grade and are tested on PACT. An additional 10 million dollars would provide funding so that an additional 6,000 to 7,000 children could be served. Since 52% of our four year olds are Medicaid births, this would bring us closer to filling the early childhood economic gap that exists in our state.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

- 1) The Office Staff of Early Childhood Education/ SC SDE cannot be in all places all over the state to deliver one – on - one technical assistance to local sites. The office needs to increase the amount of distance education training that is delivered by 1000% and increase the amount of training/staff development for early childhood state coordinators by 500%.
- 2) In an effort to improve early childhood education across our state, ECERS reviews will be conducted in 50% more sites as during 2003 – 2004 and there will be more stringent examination of those scores and how they affect student learning; both on SCRA scores and in 3rd grade PACT.
- 3) Newly developed child slots based on the additional funding would be placed in sites where quality scores on ECERS would support scores not lower than 3.50. Children in these programs would be tracked to determine their SCRA scores in kindergarten and 1st grade and their PACT scores when they reach 3rd grade.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

The office staff of OECE has been reduced by 2 positions in the last year. The amount of work seems to grow each year. In order to maintain quality ECERS positions, ensure that adequate training is delivered on SCRA, ensure that SCRA scores are accurate, ensure that standards in early childhood education classrooms are taught well, and continue collaborative work with First Steps, DSS, Palmetto Stars, Head Start, it is essential that the two lost positions be filled and that another FTE be added for the detailed work needed on early childhood assessment.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$22,870,783	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,687	\$32,132,687
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$22,870,783	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,687	\$32,132,687

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$22,659,219	\$22,514,278	\$21,832,687	\$32,132,687
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	211,564	356,505	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$22,870,783	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,687	\$32,132,687
* # FTEs:	*0	*0	*0	3

*All funds are flow-through to school districts. No funds are retained for personnel.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: EIA Bus Driver Salary

Program Director: Donald N. Tudor

Telephone: 803-734-8248

Fax: 803-734-8254

E-mail: dtudor@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Strategic Aim is Safe and Healthy Schools. The Strategic Goal is the public school transportation system is safe, functional, and adequate. The program objective is to provide safe, functional, and adequate school bus transportation to students attending three and four year old pre-kindergarten education programs.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Fiscal Year 2003-2004 objectives were met. The program provided transportation to 5,473 students.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives are the same as prior year.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

The number eligible students transported safely to and from school each day.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The Office of School transportation will provide constant oversight and monitoring of the programs to ensure objectives are met.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: EIA Bus Driver Salary

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$450,776

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

An increase is not requested.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

FY 2005 appropriation amount is required to maintain the same level of service in FY 2006.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

No FTEs are requested.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$472,210	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$472,210	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	472,210	472,210	450,776	450,776
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$472,210	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Family Literacy and Parent Support

Program Director: Estella Holliday

Telephone: 803-734-8073

Fax: 803-734-8343

E-mail: ehollida@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

(1) Program Mission Statement: Parenting/Family Literacy, under the Office of Early Childhood Education, provides leadership and services to schools and communities in developing plans and implementing strategies and services to support parents of preschool children ages birth through five years in their role as principal teachers of their children. Under The Early Childhood Development and Academic Assistance Act, 1993 (codified at S.C. Code Ann. Section 59-1-450), all school districts are required to establish a parenting or family literacy program to support parents who have children ages birth through five years and who choose to participate. Intensive and special efforts must be made to recruit parents whose children are considered at risk for school failure.

(2) FY04 Program Objectives:

- To strengthen parent involvement in the learning process of preschool children ages birth through five years.
- To promote school readiness of preschool children.
- To offer parents special opportunities to improve their literacy skills and education.
- To identify potential developmental delays in preschool children by offering developmental screening.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Documented impact of these programs were reported by school districts as listed below:

- ◆ Increased level of school readiness as per teacher observation documentation (SCRA)
- ◆ Improved parenting skills as per district surveys
- ◆ Increased parent participation in children's education as per district reports
- ◆ Improved parent-child interaction as per district surveys
- ◆ Increased number of parents enrolled in family literacy as per district reports
- ◆ Increased educational level of parents as per district reports

A special survey of 85 districts indicated that 5599 families were on waiting lists.

The Act 135 Parenting/Family Literacy data was collected online for the first time. Although many districts experienced difficulty working with this data collection system, forty districts reported the following:

Number of Families Served:

- 5,939 families received parenting instruction in their home (regularly scheduled monthly, bimonthly, or weekly home visits).
 - 7,529 children were impacted by home parenting instruction
 - 3,304 attended group parenting instruction (group meetings, workshops)
 - 2,216 parents attended adult literacy or adult education classes
 - 2,527 children were impacted
 - 714 parents graduated with a high school diploma or GED
- Parents were also served with the following services:

Support Services

- 6,859 preschool children received developmental screenings
- 31,059 families received parenting information through instructional newsletters
- 4,587 families received childcare services during parenting and family literacy classes
- 857 families received transportation services to parenting or family literacy classes
- 98% of parents enrolled in parenting/family literacy initiatives received library cards
- 139,263 Read Aloud, Family Literacy, and Character Education instructional packets were distributed

Training Provided for District Staff

- The Office of Early Childhood provided a series of six regional workshops and seminars for district parenting and family literacy educators.

Using the essential elements of family literacy, the following strategies are currently being implemented:

Essential Elements	Strategies/Programs
Literacy training for parents that leads to economic self sufficiency	Adult Basic Education Parent skill development, workshops, empowerment skills, remediation Assessments (TABE) Use of GED materials and program activities Other: Instructional materials given to parents, referral and tracking. technology instruction
Interactive literacy and school between parents and their children	Programs such as PAT, MotherRead, Parent-Child, Home Visits Parent Involvement, materials available for families, model activities Parent And Child Together Programs such as PAT, MotherRead, Parent-Child, Home Visits Parent workshops, training
Access to quality early care and education environments Access to quality early care and education environments	Center-based Activities Preschool, Before/After Care, Assessment of the children and the environment. Quality developmentally appropriate school readiness Quality child care center. Focus on teaching at an early age Center-based Activities Learning materials for parents and children including; parent handouts, magazines, parenting books, play areas Home-based services
Parent Education	Parent workshops, training Programs such as PAT, Mother \Read, PPP, PIF Community Speakers

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective of this program remain the same.

- To strengthen parent involvement in the learning process of preschool children ages birth through five years.

- To promote school readiness of preschool children.
- To offer parents special opportunities to improve their literacy skills and education.
- To identify potential developmental delays in preschool children by offering developmental screening.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Data will be collected on line as listed in Section 2.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

1. Special training activities will be provided to district parenting/family literacy coordinators and their community partners
 - to improve program quality and
 - to facilitate the on-line data collections system
2. Districts will be expected to use the Districts will be expected to report on the *South Carolina Family Literacy Performance Indicators for Quality Assurance and Evaluation*.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Family Literacy and Parent Support

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$5,855,526

From the above appropriation, proviso 1A.25 directs \$125,000 to the Accelerated Schools Project at the College of Charleston and Proviso 1A.27 directs \$200,000 to Communities in Schools.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$5,855,526

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Funding is necessary to meet the requirements of the new proviso and to implement the EOC recommendations included in their *2003 Review of Act 135 Parenting/Family Literacy Programs*.

The EOC *Review* includes the following recommendations:

- Provide "evidence to determine how extensive and successful the recruitment strategies are especially, in rural school districts where transportation is a major obstacle to parents' participation in such programs."
- Provide "professional development and staff training for individuals who carry out the functions of Act 135." These "are critically limited. While the Department of Education provided in past fiscal years training to parent educators, due to budget constraints additional training is unlikely and any future training will be targeted to family literacy programs. Based upon expenditure data by the school districts, less than 1% of all funds allocated for parenting/family literacy are expended on professional development and training. Districts in the EOC survey cite the need for quality training opportunities for the staff."
- Provide training to "focus their parenting education and family literacy activities on teen parents and first-time parents in order to in order to address long term, cyclical patterns of poverty in their community."
- "Districts in the EOC survey cite the need for quality training opportunities for the staff."
- Provide training to "focus their parenting education and family literacy activities on teen parents and first-time parents in order to in order to address long term, cyclical patterns of poverty in their community."
- "Districts in the EOC survey cite the need for quality training opportunities for the staff."

In order to accomplish these tasks, it is necessary to have a FTE in the office of early childhood education whose primary function will be to oversee the new requirements called for in this new proviso.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$6,233,946	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$5,855,526
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$6,233,946	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$5,855,526

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools and Other Entities	5,943,854	5,815,615	5,855,526	5,855,5260
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	205,694	278,420	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	84,398	39,911	0	0
TOTAL:	\$6,233,946	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$58,555,260
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Recognition (Teacher of the Year Awards)

Program Director: Kathryn Gardner-Jones

Telephone: 803-734-3451

Fax: 803-734-0312

E-mail: kjones@scteachers.org

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The primary objective of the Teacher of the Year Award is to honor exceptional teachers on both district and state levels with public recognition as well as monetary awards. These financial awards serve as an extra incentive to teachers throughout the state as they strive for excellence in the classroom. Extra incentive points are given to those teachers competing for State Teacher of the Year who have become National Board Certified. The State Teacher of the Year serves as a year-long ambassador for South Carolina's teachers as well as a primary recruitment spokesperson to those considering teaching as a profession. Honor roll teachers are active in teacher-leadership forums. District Teachers of the Year are awarded \$1,000 each. Four Honor Roll Teachers receive \$10,000 each. The State Teacher of the Year receives \$25,000.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Yes. A record eighty-four districts, (out of eighty-five), plus the Department of Juvenile Justice participated in the 2003–04 Teacher of the Year program. The State Teacher of the Year, Jason Fulmer served as an able ambassador for the state and was selected as a National Finalist for Teacher of the Year. A banquet was held on May 7, 2004 which was paid for by South Carolina business sponsors. The announcement of the five finalists, as well as the announcement of the new State Teacher of the Year received statewide press coverage in both the print and electronic media.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives are ongoing. The Teacher of the Year program is designed as a motivational tool to honor exceptional teachers on both district and state levels with public recognition and monetary awards. The State Teacher of the Year serves as a year-long ambassador for South Carolina's teachers working closely with district Teacher Cadet programs and other programs to recruit high school students into the teaching profession. The State Teacher of the Year also works closely with the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA) as a statewide teacher leader/mentor designed to encourage, mentor, and retain members of South Carolina's teaching workforce. In addition, the State

Teacher of the Year serves as a liaison between the teaching profession and the business community throughout the state. Honor roll teachers are actively involved in teacher-leadership forums, teacher cadet programs, and mentoring.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Teacher Quality strategic goals are directly tied to the Teacher of the Year program. These goals include teacher recruitment and retention as well as the placement of highly qualified, competent, ethical, and caring teachers in every classroom. Effectiveness of the Teacher of the Year program may be tied to successful school districts Teacher Cadet programs, classroom visits, mentoring, public speaking events, and teacher-leader forum participation by Teacher of the Year as well as Honor Roll teachers. The Teacher of the Year, the Honor Roll teachers, as well as the District Teachers of the Year set the standard for the state. Effectiveness of the program may be judged on the quality of the teachers selected to hold these prestigious positions. They are the standard and the professional leaders representing over 46,000 teachers.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The Division of Teacher Quality will work closely with CERRA to monitor the goals and achievement of the State Teacher of the Year as she serves her ambassadorship. The Division and CERRA will work with teachers statewide to assure that they have access to the Teacher of the Year and the Honor Roll teachers for speaking engagements, mentoring, and teacher forum activities. The Division of Teacher Quality will work with local and national press to assure that the accomplishments of the State Teacher and Honor Roll Teachers are recognized and utilized. The Division and CERRA will assist the 2004–05 State Teacher of the Year with the creation of a platform. The Division of Teacher Quality will work with statewide business through the Palmetto Horizon Foundation to create a meaningful Teacher of the Year Banquet to honor the District Teachers of the Year as well as the Honor Roll Teachers and the State Teacher of the Year.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Teacher Recognition (Teacher of the Year Awards)

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$166,102

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$166,102

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

FY 2005 appropriation is required to maintain current level of service.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$174,000	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$174,000	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	145,328	\$155,016	\$166,102	\$166,102
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	17,907	7,898	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	10,765	11,086	0	0
TOTAL:	\$174,000	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102
# FTES				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Quality

Program Director: Janice Poda

Telephone: 803-734-7896

Fax: 803-734-0312

E-mail: jpoda@scteachers.org

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

1. Improve customer service by reducing the turnaround time for processing certification requests.
2. Recommend changes in the ADEPT system to ensure that all teachers are effectively evaluated and supported.
3. Implement the revamped Program for Alternative Certification for Educators (PACE).
4. Fully implement the new recertification system for teachers.
5. Provide technical assistance to teacher education programs to assist them in implementing performance based standards.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

1. The SDE significantly improved services for a major customer base, teachers. The Office of Teacher Certification reduced the time required for teachers to obtain a certificate from an average of three months to an average of thirty working days. In addition, the number of applicant visits to the Office of Teacher Certification in Columbia was reduced from 18,227 in FY 2000 to 4,082 in FY 2003. We accomplished this reduction by establishing a convenient twenty-four-hour-access Web site at <http://www.scteachers.org>, which allows over 136,000 teachers to have immediate access to their certification records and additional pertinent information. This system has provided more timely service to teachers, reduced the number of personal visits to the office, and improved customer satisfaction.
2. Changes were made to the ADEPT statute through passage of recent legislation.
3. The revamped Program for Alternative Certification for Educators (PACE) has been fully implemented and serves a cohort of candidates for teaching in five regional locations. There are approximately 1100 participants in PACE in years 1-3 of the program.
4. The new certificate renewal system has been implemented in all districts statewide. Full implementation follows two years of pilots with the involvement of about one-third of the districts in the state.
5. The DTQ provided technical assistance and training in the following topics to all teacher education programs: National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Assessment, Conceptual Framework, National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AHPERD), Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), and BOE/STATE NCATE Training.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for this fiscal year have changed because the objectives from the previous year have been accomplished. The objectives for 2004-05 are:

1. Implement an online certification application that an applicant can completely electronically or download and complete and mail in.
2. Streamline the process for conducting background checks on teacher candidates by implementing an electronic system.
3. Implement the changes that are required to conduct background checks on teacher candidates prior to student teaching.
4. Revise the regulations and guidelines for the ADEPT Program.
5. Publish a state report card on each teacher education program.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

1. The online application will go into operation by the end of the 2004-05 fiscal year.
2. The Division of Teacher Quality's database allows us to track the average turnaround time for receiving background reports from the FBI/SLED.
3. The Division of Teacher Quality will conduct background checks on all teacher candidates who will student teach in fall 2005 during spring 2005.
4. Revisions to regulation 43-205.1 and accompanying guidelines will be adopted by the State Board of Education and the regulation changes will be promulgated by the General Assembly.
5. A state report card on each teacher education program will be published in winter 2005.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The results of our objectives are reported to the State Board of Education and other oversight bodies as required.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Teacher Quality

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$543,821

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$543,821
0% change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

The base appropriation is the only funding that the State Department of Education receives to operate the Division of Teacher Quality (other than funds for the Office of Teacher Certification) and fulfill the statutory responsibilities assigned to that Division. The Division of Teacher Quality is responsible for implementing the statewide ADEPT (Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching) Program and accrediting and providing technical assistance for the thirty-two teacher education programs in the state in addition to the other requirements for improving teacher quality. These funds are also used for rent, leasing copy machines, maintenance of the computer system, and other general operating expenses.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

None requested.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$569,679	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$569,679	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$92,507	\$109,740	92,141	92,141
Supplies & Materials	22,376	21,022	73,400	73,400
Contractual Services	103,634	85,406	89,542	89,542
Equipment	5,244	50,679	15,000	15,000
Fixed Charges	215,228	235,825	226,500	226,500
Travel	9,389	9,874	14,900	14,900
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	32,338	32,338
Budget Reductions	18,797	25,858	0	0
Balance Remaining	102,504	31,275	0	0
TOTAL:	\$569,679	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821
# FTES:	1	1	1	1

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Salary Supplement and Employer Contributions

Program Director: Mellanie Jinnette

Telephone: 803-734-3605

Fax: 803-734-8574

E-mail: mjinnett@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Program Mission Statement/Strategic Aim. Teacher Quality. Ensure an adequate supply of quality, caring and competent teachers for all South Carolina classroom by promoting strategies for the recruitment, training and retention of teachers.

Strategic Goals:

- 2.1 Teacher recruitment and retention programs are successful
- 2.2 Teacher preparation programs produce highly qualified teachers.
- 2.3 Teachers are qualified, competent, ethical, and caring.
- 2.4 Teacher professional development programs are effective

FY 2004 Program Objective: Achieve a SC average teacher salary as directed and funded by the General Assembly.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

FY 2003-04 program objective was met.

Primary measure is supply of highly qualified teachers and teacher retention through providing competitive compensation.

Program is measured against achieving the General Assembly stated salary goal. This program provides additional compensation for teachers in order to meet or exceed the estimated Southeastern Average Teacher's Salary.

FY 2004 SC average teacher salary goal was \$40,659. Average teacher salary attained was \$41,162.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Program Objective: Achieve a SC average teacher salary as directed and funded by the General Assembly. FY 2005 goal is \$41,691. Revised projection is \$42,045.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Primary measure is supply of highly qualified teachers and teacher retention through providing competitive compensation.

Program is measured against achieving the General Assembly stated salary goal. This program provides additional compensation for teachers in order to meet or exceed the estimated Southeastern Average Teacher's Salary.

Data source will be the Professional Certified Staff (PCS) system.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Districts will be required to pay the FY 2005 South Carolina State Minimum Salary Schedule.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Teacher Salary Supplement and Employer Contributions

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

The 2004-05 Base Appropriation is \$220,402,230 for Teacher Salary Supplement and \$41,105,016 for Teacher Salary Increase Fringe Benefits. Total is \$261,507,246.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

EIA Teacher Salary Supplement	\$106,135,680
EIA Teacher Salary Increase Fringe Benefits	\$19,741,236
Total	\$125,876,916

Decrease is \$135,630,330 and 56%.

This request must be synchronized with the Education Finance Act, National Board Certification, and Teacher Specialist appropriation requests.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

The State Minimum Salary Schedule would increase by 1.55% and the average SC teacher salary would increase by approximately 1.65%. This request is predicated on General Assembly funding the base student cost at \$2,290.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

This request synchronized with the EFA, national board certification, and teacher specialist requests provides teacher salary supplement and related fringe to exceed the southeastern average teacher salary by \$300. The SC average salary goal for FY 2006 is set to be \$42,737 and is projected to exceed the southeastern average teacher salary by \$300. The State Minimum Salary Schedule would increase by 1.55% and the average SC teacher salary would increase by approximately 1.65%. This request is subject to the General Assembly's action on the following budget requests: EFA, National Board Certification, Teacher Specialist. This program permits the state to achieve or exceed the projected southeastern average teacher salary. Program success will be measured by comparing South Carolina average teacher salary to the southeastern average teacher salary. For FY 2004, the South Carolina average teacher salary is \$41,162. The FY 2005 projected South Carolina average teacher salary is \$42,045. The FY 2006 projected southeast average teacher salary is \$42,437. These salary estimates included National Board Certification and Teacher Specialist incentives. The EIA teacher salary supplement and fringe line items complement base funding for teacher salaries. This program provides for meeting the southeastern average teacher salary as projected by the office of Research and Statistics, Budget and Control Board. This item is designated a high priority because it provides teacher salaries at the estimated SD average. Applicable state Statute: S.C. Code Ann. § 59-20-50(b). SDE current resources are inadequate to cover the increase.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

No FTEs are requested.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$226,935,697	\$242,444,103	\$261,507,246	\$125,876,916
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	\$12,181,345	0
TOTAL:	\$226,935,697	\$242,444,103	\$273,688,591	\$125,876,916

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$219,079,966	\$230,262,758	\$275,932,129	\$125,876,916
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	7,855,731	\$12,181,345	0	0
TOTAL:	\$226,935,697	\$242,444,103	\$275,932,129	\$125,876,916
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Critical Teaching Needs Program

Program Director: Beth Cope

Telephone: 803-734-8116

Fax: 803-734-4387

E-mail: bcope@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objectives of the Critical Teaching Needs Program are related to the long-range plan of increasing the number of teachers with advanced degrees and validation of teacher professional development needs consistent with national and state standards. In the application for this program, school districts determine needs for professional development based upon one or more of the following: (1) needs established in the District Strategic Plan or School Improvement Plan, (2) Middle Schools Project Course, (3) Preparation for Technologies Program, (4) Curriculum Standards Training, and (5) Students with Disabilities or Special Needs.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

The Critical Teaching Needs Grant program met the 2003-04 objectives of providing leadership and guidance for selection and implementation of teaching training courses as stated in S. C. Code Ann 59-5-60, and as outlined in the Critical Teaching Needs program. In 2003-04, eighty-five school districts received funds ranging from \$2,381 to \$17,726, for a total of \$602,911. Three consortia were formed, and these provided services to approximately 21 districts. Other districts provided courses through their respective districts. The total unduplicated count of CTN courses offered was 111, and the total number of teachers participating was approximately 1821. The percentage of courses in approved subjects areas during the 2003-04 were as follows: 20 percent—technology; 16 percent—reading; 3 percent—mathematics; 19 percent—science; 14 percent—special needs; and 28 percent in other approved courses aligned with specific needs of the districts. In 2003-04, Roper Mountain Science Center in Greenville County received \$250,000 to offer 17 science courses to 237 science teachers from around the state. College credit from Furman University was available.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Implement the Critical Teaching Needs program for teachers of subjects in grades one through twelve for all districts to encourage the offering of specially designed courses for certificate renewal or graduate credit in mathematics, science, reading, computer education, or other critical areas identified through district assessment and delivered by the district, colleges, universities, or through consortium arrangements.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

To continue to collect data on the number of districts served, the number of teachers participating, and the funds received by the participating districts.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The program objectives will continue to be reviewed and compared with district/participant data.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Critical Teaching Needs

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$602,911

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$602,911
0% change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

FY 2005 appropriation amount is required to maintain the same level of service in FY2006.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	600,411	591,564	602,911	602,911
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	2,500	11,347	0	0
TOTAL:	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: National Board Certification

Program Director: Janice Poda (SDE)
Ann Byrd (CERRA)

Telephone: 803-734-7896 (SDE)
803-323-4032, Ext. 6411 (CERRA)

Fax: 803-734-0312 (SDE)
803-323-4044 (CERRA)

e-mail: jpoda@scteachers.org (SDE)
byrda@winthrop.edu (CERRA)

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The primary objective of the National Board Certification incentive is to reward teachers who have completed the rigorous assessment that demonstrates that they are accomplished teachers. The incentive provides a means for teachers to remain in the classroom while earning higher salaries, and, therefore, helps the State Department of Education and the Education Oversight Committee accomplish its strategic goal of retaining successful teachers in the classroom.

The goal for National Board Certification is to have 5,000 National Board Certified in South Carolina by 2005.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

South Carolina currently has 3,226 (an increase from 2,350) teachers who are National Board Certified, representing a 37% increase from the previous year. Currently, there are approximately 800 applicants and approximately 825 retake candidates who are awaiting their scores in November 2004. These applicants comprise twenty percent of all applicants from throughout the country for National Board Certification.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The state has two remaining years (announcements will be made in November 2004 and 2005) to reach its goal of having 5,000 National Board Certified teachers. In order to accomplish that goal, 887 teachers must achieve National Board Certification during 2003-04 and 2004-05.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

The announcement of the teachers who receive National Board Certification in Winter 2004.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Support will be provided to the candidates for National Board certification. An effort will be made to recruit more middle level teachers.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: National Board Certification

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$39,244,874

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

Total Requested is \$43,854,900
Requested increase is for \$4,610,026 (10.6%).

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

Based on previous achievement rates and current NBPTS certified teachers, the State anticipates having approximately 4,112 NBPTS certified teachers by November 2004 and a total of 5,000 by November 2005 (FY 2006). The State also anticipates an additional 1,200 new applicants.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Provide incentives for teachers who earn National Board Certification and pay the application fee for applicants in an effort to recognize and retain accomplished teachers in the classroom.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

None requested

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$12,024,241	36,803,080	27,968,264	32,578,290
General Fund	20,790,266	0	11,276,610	11,276,610
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify) Receipts	19,600	5,150	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$32,834,107	\$36,808,230	\$39,244,874	\$43,854,900

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services---Research Study		67,216	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	20,693,856	27,768,267	36,054,874	41,000,000
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
NBPTS—Application Fees	2,995,300	2,869,000	3,000,000	2,754,900
CERRA	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
GSAH, John De La Howe	22,662	53,392	60,000	0
IDT's DJJ, SCADB	0	8,899	0	0
Fee Reimbursement to teachers for banked scores	0	29,000	30,000	0
Transfer for EFA-Proviso 1.81	0	5,912,456	0	0
Budget Reduction	7,129,907			
Balance Remaining	1,892,382	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$32,834,107	\$36,808,230	\$39,244,874	\$43,854,900
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Supplies

Program Director: Mellanie Jinnette

Telephone: 803-734-3605

Fax: 803-734-8574

E-mail: mjinnett@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Program Mission Statement/Strategic Aim. Teacher Quality. Ensure an adequate supply of quality, caring and competent teachers for all South Carolina classrooms by promoting strategies for the recruitment, training and retention of teachers.

Strategic Goals:

- 2.5 Teacher recruitment and retention programs are successful
- 2.6 Teacher preparation programs produce highly qualified teachers.
- 2.7 Teachers are qualified, competent, ethical, and caring.
- 2.8 Teacher professional development programs are effective

FY 2004 Program Objective: Improve teacher retention by providing \$200 per qualifying teacher for reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses related to purchases for the classroom.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

FY 2003-04 program objectives were met in accordance with the Proviso outlined below.

1A.36.(SDE-EIA: XI.C.3-Teacher Supplies) From the funds appropriated, all certified public school, certified special school classroom teachers, certified media specialists, and certified guidance counselors who are employed by a school district or a charter school as of November 30 of the current fiscal year, shall receive reimbursement of two hundred dollars each school year to offset expenses incurred by them for teaching supplies and materials. Funds shall be disbursed by the department to School districts by July 15 based on the last reconciled Professional Certified Staff (PCS) listing from the previous year. Any deviation in the PCS and actual teacher count will be reconciled by December 31 or as soon as practicable thereafter. School districts shall disburse these funds in a manner separate and distinct from their payroll check on the first day teachers, by contract, are required to be in attendance at school for the current contract year. This reimbursement shall not be considered by the state as taxable income. Special schools include the Governor's School for Science and Math, the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities, Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School, John de la Howe School, School for the Deaf and the Blind, Felton Lab, Department of Juvenile Justice, and Palmetto Unified School District. Funds distributed to school districts or allocated to schools must not supplant existing supply money paid to teachers from other sources. If a school district requires receipts for tax purposes the receipts may not be required

before December 31. Districts that do not wish to require receipts may have teachers retain the receipts and certify for the district they have received the \$200 for purchase of teaching supplies and/or materials and that they have purchased or will purchase supplies and/or materials during the fiscal year for the amount of \$200. Districts shall not have an audit exception related to non-retention of receipts in any instances where a similar instrument is utilized. Any district requiring receipts must notify any teacher from whom receipts have not been submitted between November 25 and December 6 that receipts must be submitted to the district. Districts may not add any additional requirement not listed herein related to this reimbursement. The department must withhold local school innovation funds from any district while in non-compliance with this provision. Any funds not disbursed to teachers may not be retained by the districts and must be returned to the department.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives have not changed for FY 2004-05.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Primary measure is compliance with the proviso.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

SDE and districts must comply with the proviso.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Teacher Supplies

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

The FY 2004-05 base appropriation is \$10,000,000.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

FY 2005-06 Total amount requested is \$10,000,000 a 0% change from FY 2004-05.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

SDE is not requesting an increase in this funding for FY 2005-06.

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

The current levels of funding are adequate to meet the needs.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
Transfers from Operating	113,136	239,639	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,113,136	\$10,239,639	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$9,780,925	\$9,756,573	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Allocations to Governor's Schools	2,251	1,800		
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	329,960	481,266	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,113,136	\$10,239,639	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Professional Development on Standards

Program Director: Marc Drews

Telephone: 803-734-5836

Fax: 803-734-5953

E-mail: mdrews@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What is the program mission statement and what were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed).*

The mission for the Professional Development on Standards program is to expand the capacity of teachers to implement and support standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. \$4.435 million was allocated directly to districts in support of this mission through the Professional Development for Standards Implementation Program (PDSI). The 2003–04 goals were to

- enhance capacity of teachers to implement and support standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices, and
- increase teacher knowledge of the subject matter content.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.*

Each district is required to submit a report summarizing the progress made toward these goals. A copy of the report may be found on the State Department of Education (SDE) Web site <<http://www.myscschools.com/Offices/CSO/pdsi/>>. The Office of Curriculum and Standards monitored the PDSI program, conducting desk audits of the summary reports. Based on the district's information included in their summary reports (as of September 28, 2004), these funds supported the professional development of over 32,500 teachers. The chart below shows the breakdown of grade-level and content emphasis.

Content Area	Elementary	Middle	High	Total	Percent
English Language Arts	5568	1873	1218	8659	26.6%
Foreign Language	77	57	141	275	0.8%
Health	273	152	148	573	1.8%
Mathematics	3777	1210	738	5725	17.6%
Physical Education	105	80	91	276	0.8%
Science	2412	1102	578	4092	12.6%
Social Studies	2700	1022	629	4351	13.4%
Visual and Performing Arts	156	94	96	346	1.1%
Multi-curricular	4582	2258	1367	8207	25.2%
Total	19,650 60.5%	7,848 24.1%	5,006 15.4%	32,504	

This table represents a breakdown of the districts' expenditures. The professional development included coursework (26.7 percent in FY04, up from 14.6 percent in FY03), instructional workshops (29.9 percent in FY04 down from 34.1 percent in FY03), content workshops (13.8 percent in FY04 down from 30.4 percent), and other training support (29.5 percent in FY04 up from 20.9 percent).

Expenditure Category	2002-03	2003-04
Personnel costs	25.9%	27.1%
Professional development opportunities	50.0%	43.2%
Materials and supplies	23.1%	25.6%

Funds also supported the work of the Office of Curriculum and Standards' South Carolina Reading Initiative, the Mathematics and Science Unit (MSU), and implementation of standards in the areas of social studies, foreign language, physical education, and the visual and performing arts.

Funds also supported the implementation of Curriculum Calibration, a method for measuring the degree of alignment of classroom assignments with grade level state standards. During 2003–04, 399 schools participated in the process that provided valuable feedback to the individual schools through a series of on-site presentations on the implementation of standards-based instructional programs (in 2002–03, there were 362 schools). The report of the findings based on 348,731 assignments and participant feedback surveys are found on the SDE Web site, (<http://www.myscschools.com/offices/cso/enhance/curriculumcalibration-overview.htm>)

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The 2004–05 goals are to

- enhance capacity of teachers to implement and support standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices, and
- increase teacher knowledge of the subject matter content.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004-05?

Districts will continue to be required to submit a summary report that includes the following item that assesses teacher quality and performance. The data from these reports will be used to assess the program effectiveness.

- Using the data from your district's evaluation, what improvement in teachers' knowledge and practice (as demonstrated in the classroom) do you attribute to the strategies implemented by your district.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Measurable actions that will be undertaken to assure that the program objectives are met include

- on-going electronic assistance, both through a listserv and Web-based support; and
- an on-line summary report requirement.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Professional Development on Standards

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$6,204,060

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$6,204,060
0% increase

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to meet the program objectives:

- to enhance capacity of teachers to implement and support standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices, and
- to increase teacher knowledge of the subject matter content.

These practices and services allow classroom teachers the opportunity to increase their knowledge so that students can improve their achievement.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$6,646,260	\$6,646,260	\$6,204,060	\$6,204,060
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	1,358,635	1,996,685	1,790,575	0
TOTAL:	\$8,004,895	\$8,642,945	\$7,994,635	\$6,204,060

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$43,162	\$29,083	\$17,000	\$14,000
Supplies & Materials	138,575	146,564	225,300	31,000
Contractual Services	1,570,337	1,420,980	1,897,335	951,757
Equipment	15,720	4,799	20,000	5,000
Fixed Charges	22,901	40,230	46,500	6,000
Travel	25,624	26,004	55,900	15,000
Allocations to Districts/Entities	3,965,450	4,872,937	5,732,600	5,181,303
Employer Contributions	2,140	5,028	0	0
Budget Reduction	224,300	306,745	0	0
Balance Remaining	1,996,686	1,790,575	0	0
TOTAL:	\$8,004,895	\$8,642,945	\$7,994,635	\$6,204,060
# FTES:	*.30	*.30	*.30	*.30

* Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for .30 of an FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$30,000) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Office of Curriculum and Standards Regional Mathematics and Science Centers (Proviso 1A.31)

Program Director: John T. Holton

Telephone: 803-734-8311

Fax: 803-734-5953

E-mail: jholton@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the program is to support improvements in mathematics and science through resources and professional development in instructional techniques and strategies, use of technology, leadership, content in subject areas and assessment. This is accomplished through 8 regional mathematics and science centers that house math and science specialists who provide technical assistance and professional development to teachers and schools.

- a. Provide professional development to schools and districts to increase teacher knowledge and instructional practice to increase student achievement in mathematics and science.
- b. Train, place, and support elementary (grades K–5) school level coaches in mathematics and science who will help teachers to increase their content and pedagogical knowledge so that instruction is improved and student achievement rises.
- c. Support the use of exemplary science curriculum materials in elementary and middle schools and to provide special support for elementary mathematics instruction.
- d. Provide specific professional development for high school teachers of algebra and physical science to benefit students who are to take the exit examination beginning during the current school year.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

- a. During the 2003–04 school year the mathematics and science centers provided high quality professional development to teachers in one hundred and forty-three schools in fifty-three school districts in the following areas: Standards and Practice, curriculum work, STEMS, and so forth.
- b. The initial goal of training and supporting coaches in thirty schools was exceeded by three. The seventeen mathematics and sixteen science coaches provided over 20,000 hours of professional development support to 785 elementary teachers. We are in the process of careful data analysis to measure effectiveness of the intervention. Thirty-one of the thirty-three cohort one schools have renewed their commitment to coaching and an additional thirty schools will have coaches during the 2004–05 school year.
- c. Two thousand hours of kit and exemplary science materials training was provided by the math and science center staff to forty-two schools in twenty-four school districts.

- d. Nine hundred and eighty-five teachers received professional development from the SC Algebra Classroom (485 teachers) and the Physical Science Companion and Inquiry Workshops (500 teachers).

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will provide professional development to schools and districts to increase teacher knowledge and instructional practice to increase student achievement in mathematics and science.
- b. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will continue to train, place, and support elementary (grades K–5) school level coaches in mathematics and science who will help teachers to increase their content and pedagogical knowledge so that instruction is improved and student achievement rises. In addition, districts will be able to receive training so that individual districts can use the Mathematics and Science Coaching Model to support its own professional development.
- c. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will support the use of exemplary science curriculum materials in elementary and middle schools and to provide special support for elementary mathematics instruction through the Creating Excellence in Elementary Mathematics (CEEM) as well as the elementary and middle school version of the Dynamic Classroom Assessment.
- d. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will provide specific professional development for high school teachers of algebra and physical science to benefit students who are to take the exit examination beginning during the current school year. Develop and deploy the Biology Companion, which provides similar support for biology teachers as the Physical Science Companion.

Explanation of changes: The Mathematics and Science Unit has developed several new professional development and curriculum support projects. These have been added to the program objectives for the 2004–05 fiscal year.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

- a. PACT scores for schools with mathematics and science coaches as well as calibration data showing that larger percentages of teacher assignments are aligned with standards.
- b. Number of schools and teachers impacted by training and support activities for science curriculum materials and teachers using the mathematics materials.
- c. Percentages of students who are successful on the exit examinations and other high school assessments as a result of participation by teachers in the SC Algebra Classroom and the Physical Science Companion.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Professional development activities provided by the Mathematics and Science Center specialists will be reported using the CoreData system that was developed by the Statewide Systemic Initiative. For new programs (coaching, the Algebra Classroom, and the Physical Science Companion) the data from the spring of 2004 testing administration will serve as the baseline for data.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Office of Curriculum and Standards Regional Mathematics and Science Centers

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

The Base appropriate is \$2,900,382.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The total amount requested is \$2,900,382, a 0% increase over the 2004–05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to meet these objectives and to expand on them:

- a. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will provide professional development to schools and districts to increase teacher knowledge and instructional practice to increase student achievement in mathematics and science.
- b. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will continue to train, place, and support elementary (grades K–5) school level coaches in mathematics and science who will help teachers to increase their content and pedagogical knowledge so that instruction is improved and student achievement rises. In addition, districts will be able to receive training so that individual districts can use the Mathematics and Science Coaching Model to support its own professional development.
- c. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will support the use of exemplary science curriculum materials in elementary and middle schools and to provide special support for elementary mathematics instruction through the Creating Excellence in Elementary Mathematics (CEEM) as well as the elementary and middle school version of the Dynamic Classroom Assessment.
- d. Mathematics and Science Center specialists will provide specific professional development for high school teachers of algebra and physical science to benefit students who are to take the exit examination beginning during the current school year. Develop and deploy the Biology Companion, which provides similar support for biology teachers as the Physical Science Companion.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$3,038,290	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,038,290	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$2,653,888	2,829,017	2,900,382	2,900,382
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	100,251	137,908	0	0
	284,150	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	71,365	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,038,289	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382
# FTES:	*1	*1	*1	*1

* Budget figures do not include salary and fringe (30%) for one FTE to administer the program. This amount (\$96,700) is paid for through SDE operating funds.

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Progress Energy School Leadership Executive Institute

Program Director: Bonnie M. Tuten

Telephone: 803-734-8558

Fax: 803-734-5486

E-mail: ktuten@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

PARTICIPANT OBJECTIVES

Participants will:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • translate their learning modality to others' learning modalities by.... 	designing a plan to reorganize classrooms to take advantage of all students' learning modalities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • translate their learning processing styles to others' learning processing styles by... 	ensuring that teachers use assessment results to facilitate student learning for high achievement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they have learned to deal with difficult people by... 	identifying their "most difficult employee" and designing an action plan for that employee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they understand the uses of symbolic leadership by... 	diagnosing the organizational culture for their school and implementing strengthened/streamlined processes and procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they understand how to manage difficult/marginal teachers by... 	constructing a documentation plan for 2003-2004 using the format presented in class
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they understand the process of change and can manage it on a school level by... 	examining different stages of the change process and providing leadership in their schools.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they can conduct effective meetings by... 	assessing meeting agendas, minutes and feedback from their school to practice effective techniques
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they are effective facilitators by... 	assessing feedback from their constituencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they understand the process of strategic planning by... 	aligning the school's professional development plan with its school renewal plan and state standards

• demonstrate that they can manage conflict by...	practicing and modeling methods of defining and defusing potential conflict situations
• demonstrate that they can design effective staff development by...	utilizing national and South Carolina staff development standards to create a local activity
• demonstrate their understanding of building capacity by...	creating a process to extend and enrich teachers' professional practice
• demonstrate their understanding of the writing process by...	successfully completing all written assignments
• demonstrate their understanding of the basics of technology by...	using an instrument to assess the use of technology in their school and creating a technology plan
• demonstrate their knowledge of personnel procedures by...	using case studies to build and refine an effective supervision process
• demonstrate their understanding of multiple data sources by...	disaggregating their own test data and developing an accountability plan for their school
• demonstrate their understanding of lesson design by...	monitoring and evaluating lesson plans
• demonstrate their understanding of curriculum alignment by...	comparing lesson plans to the SC standards and working with teachers to align teaching to the standards
• demonstrate their ability to build broad based partnerships by...	developing a school marketing plan
• demonstrate their understanding of the observation/evaluation process by...	developing an action plan that includes steps needed to assess teachers' classroom performance
• demonstrate their understanding of the conferencing process by...	successfully practicing conferencing skills with cohort participants

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Fiscal year objectives were met.

100% of the 80 participants in the second year of the program, and 100% of the 90 participants in the first year of the program met the objectives set for Year One or Year Two (as listed above), completed all assignments acceptably, met attendance requirements, and submitted acceptable action plans in order to complete their year. The percentage of retention of participants through completion of the program remained stable at 98%. The focus of the program remained data-driven decision-making, strategic planning, best practices, and organizational leadership. To date 38.7% of South Carolina's almost 1200 principals have completed or are enrolled in the program. With the ability to start new programs for approximately 90- principals per year, it will take nine more years to reach all sitting principals. Research indicates that 37% of all South Carolina administrators will be able to retire within the next five years. So, in actuality, the program will need to continue to reach the new principals who come into the profession at the rate of 100 to 140 a year in the state. The program has continued to be intensive, long-term, job-embedded, as required by No Child Left Behind legislation.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives for 2004-2005 remain the same.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

Measures and data collection will remain the same. An online survey is being completed by graduates of 2002-2003 programs. The survey indicates that participants have used the knowledge, skills, and content obtained from the program in school improvement efforts, in particular those areas that deal with data-driven decision making and working with teachers in curriculum and instruction issues. Analysis of test scores and school report cards indicates that test scores are up above state average in several grade levels, in English Language Arts and Math.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

The program objectives will continue to be monitored by the Program Director and the faculty who teach in the program.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Progress Energy School Leadership Executive Institute (SLEI)

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$906,370

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

\$906,370
0% change

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding allows six groups of principals to complete, start, or continue a two-year leadership development program. At this level of participation, it will take a minimum of nine years to train all of the state's almost 1200 principals, and that doesn't take into consideration the large number of retiring administrators, who will be replaced in the near future, and whose replacements will need training. It also allows two groups of aspiring principals to be trained over the year. Two groups of district administrators are trained in the year. And one group of aspiring superintendents is trained. All these programs come out of the SLEI budget, although the bulk of funding remains the Leadership Institute for principals.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$949,466	\$949,466	\$906,370	\$906,370
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant Progress Energy-3035	286,412	117,197	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$630,373	\$411,268	\$302,185	0
TOTAL:	\$1,866,251	\$1,477,931	\$1,208,555	\$906,370

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$84,230	\$3,000	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	18,750	176,523	236,000	0
Contractual Services	1,270,915	944,611	943,179	906,370
Equipment	0	0	6,464	0
Fixed Charges	16,741	16,721	21,012	0
Travel	4,129	4,192	1,900	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	570	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	60,218	30,129	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	411,268	302,185		0
TOTAL:	\$1,866,251	\$1,477,931	\$1,208,555	\$906,370
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Principal Salary Supplement

Program Director: Mellanie Jinnette

Telephone: 803-734-3605

Fax: 803-734-8574

E-mail: mjinnett@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

To supplement principal salaries to enable districts to attract and retain competent principals.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

Fiscal Year 2003-2004 objectives were met.

Average salary for head principals increased from \$72,530 in FY 2003 to \$73,196 in FY 2004. Average salary for assistant principals increased from \$57,771 in FY 2003 to \$58,007 in FY 2004.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

To supplement principal salaries to enable districts to attract and retain competent principals.

Objectives have not changed for FY 2004-2005.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

The effectiveness measure of this program is the state's ability to provide competitive compensation in order to attract and maintain high quality school leadership.

Data source will be the Professional Certified Staff (PCS) System.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

Districts are required to expend funds in accordance with the "Funding Manual".

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Principal Salary Supplement

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

The base appropriation for FY 2004-05 is \$3,095,968.

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

An increase is not requested.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

FY 2005 appropriation amount is required to maintain the same level of service in FY 2006.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

No FTEs are requested.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968
# FTES:				

FY 2004–05 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Junior Academy of Science (Proviso 1A.4)

Program Director: Don M. Jordan
USC, Science Education Center, Room 323
Sumwalt
Columbia, SC 29208

Telephone: 803-777-7007

Fax: 803-777-4396

E-mail: Jordan@gwm.sc.edu

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2003–04? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The South Carolina Junior Academy of Science (SCJAS) strives to

- ◆ provide opportunities for students to participate in enrichment activities that can sharpen critical thinking, reward high academic achievement, and strengthen national competitiveness.
- ◆ provide opportunities for science and mathematics teachers to participate in enrichment activities that can improve classroom effectiveness, enhance professional growth, and cultivate leadership capabilities.
- ◆ provide opportunities for individual schools to participate in enrichment activities that can stimulate parental involvement, raise levels of community interest, and intensify school prestige.
- ◆ increase the number of K–12 students, teachers and schools participating in science, mathematics, and engineering activities.
- ◆ enhance the competitiveness of South Carolina students at the Annual International Science and Engineering Fairs (ISEF) (grades 9–12).
- ◆ improve public understanding of and appreciation for the role of science, mathematics, and engineering in the State.
- ◆ expand the Middle and Elementary Schools Academy of Science (MESAS) program in the state of South Carolina.
- ◆ increase the number of students in grades 5–8 in South Carolina that are nominated for Discovery Channel Young Science Challenge (DCYSC) and increase the number of winners from this pool at the national level.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2003–04 objectives met? Please provide specific, quantifiable data and explanations. *(Please include the number of students served, the percentage increase or decrease in services provided, summary information from any recent internal or external evaluations of the program, and information contained in any budget request to the Budget and Control Board. All effectiveness measures should be reflected in quantifiable and not anecdotal data. For example, "there was a 5% increase in the total number of students in the program resulting in an additional 100 students and a 10% increase in the total number of minorities in the program over the past three years.)*

The two junior divisions of the South Carolina Academy of Science include approximately 1,500 Junior Academy members (grades 9–12) representing approximately 70 active high schools and 3,000 Middle/Elementary Academy members (grades 4–8) representing over 150 active middle/elementary schools. The SCJAS Newsletter was written, edited, published, and mailed to SCJAS and MESAS members four times during the past year.

Twenty events were sponsored, including 6 workshops (3 high schools and 3 middle/elementary) and 8 regional science fairs (which sent 4 to 8 students from each region to International Science and Engineering Fair, resulting in international-winners). The other events included the SCAS Annual Meeting, the Mail-In Contest and the Young Research Grants-in-Aid Program. This year's event winners received certificates, cash awards, special recognition from sponsoring groups, as well as trips to national labs, camps and the AAAS meeting (see May 2004 issue of SCJAS newsletter for details).

In 2003, in the Region II Science Fair, we had 610 students and 126 teachers participate in the fair. The students were selected by over 200 judges comprised of college professors, medical scientists, U.S. Army, Marine, and Air Force officers, as well as business leaders from the Midlands Community. Awards were available in 52 major categories, such as Engineering, Women in Science, Vision Science, Chemistry, etc. Most awards had Junior, Senior, and Team subcategories, often with 1st, 2nd, 3rd and Honorary Mention standings awarded. There were a total of 195 awards given among those varied categories and standings. This is just one Regional Science Fair in the state, others have similar programs.

Fall workshops are sponsored annually by one of the regions' four-year colleges or technical colleges. The workshops provide opportunities to share ideas among fellow students, to familiarize students with the area's scientific community, and to learn scientific techniques as well as how to do a research project. The workshops also develop an understanding among students about the research process. A secondary purpose is to motivate and recruit students into the fields of science, mathematics and engineering.

We have had three grand award winners: John Korman of Riverside High School (SCJAS Board Member 2002), Bevin Hutcherson and Paul Sagona as a team from Crestwood High School in Sumter South Carolina, and in 2003 Katie Van Schaik, a junior at Spring Valley High School in Columbia, was "Best of Category" award recipient. This award was sponsored by the Intel Science and Engineering Fair. It is no small task to be best in the world, when you are competing with the magnet schools all over the U.S. In 2004 we did not have a top winner, but we did place in the Statistics Award, Environmental Science and scholarships.

Our activities have made a difference at grade levels 4–12.

In addition, in the Middle/Elementary School Academy of Science, over 7,000 students in grades 5–8 were nominated world wide by Science Services affiliated fairs. Winners at those fairs were then nominated to enter their projects in the 2004 Discovery Channel Young Scientist Challenge (DCYSC). From this outstanding pool of students, DCYSC judges selected 400 talented semifinalists based on the scientific merit of their work and their ability to communicate about the scientific information regarding their project. Discovery Channel Young Scientist Challenge named 10 semifinalists (a 100 percent increase over last year) from South Carolina in the fourth Annual Science Contest in 2004, providing ample evidence that the Academy's effort to strengthen the eight science fair regions in South Carolina is making a positive difference.

The establishment of the additional Middle / Elementary School Academy of Science is making progress. We have provided the initial contacts and are working with the school system to establish MESAS Region VII. This will be called the Sea Island Region VII MESAS

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. To increase the number of K–12 students, teachers, and schools, participating in science, mathematics, and engineering activities.
- b. To enhance the competitiveness of South Carolina students at the Annual International Science and Engineering Fairs (ISEF) (grades 9–12).
- c. To improve public understanding of and appreciation for the role of science, mathematics, and engineering in the state.
- d. To expand the MESAS program from four regions to five regions and to update and modernize Regions I, IV, & V.

- e. To provide mathematics and science teachers in the state with enrichment activities that can improve classroom effectiveness, promote professional growth, and promote the development of leadership skills.
- f. To expand our efforts with The State Museum and coordinate events with EdVenture children's museum.
- g. To complete the establishment a journal for citizens of South Carolina from all levels of scientific involvement, from high school students to Nobel Prize winners, to publish their works, findings and articles. The initial issue of the SCAS Journal is available online at www.scacadsci.org. (No other such journal exists in South Carolina)
- h. A statewide initiative will be implemented for the purpose of raising additional funds from corporate and private sources that will be used to support awards and sustain this initiative.

4. What measures or data will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program in meeting its objectives for the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05?

- a. Three national winners (top in their category) at International Science and Engineering Fair in the last four years (prior years zero 0).
- b. Twenty-three DCYSC semifinalists in the last four years (prior years zero 0).
- c. Two hundred and fifty-four students state-wide competing in the SCAS MESAS Mail-in contest. (prior year 201)
- d. We will compare the number of students attending the South Carolina Academy of Science Annual Meeting and presenting research papers with attendance numbers from prior years.
- e. We will compare the number of students attending MESAS Workshops in the four MESAS regions with attendance numbers from prior years.
- f. We will compare the number of students receiving funds from our Young Research Grants-in-Aid Program with the number of students participating in prior years.
- g. We will compare the number of teachers receiving certification as a Certified Metric Specialist with the number of teachers certified from prior years and from other states.
- h. We will compare the number of schools in each science fair region starting a school-wide science fair program with the current number of schools already involved in school-wide science fair programs. The objective of collecting this data is to have every child in South Carolina involved with the scientific process by creating and participating in a local school-wide science fair competitions. (inquiry based learning.)
- i. We will compare the number of students presenting research papers in grades 4–12 with states with similar programs.
- j. We will compare the number of students who receive national recognition with South Carolina with students from other states.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2004–05, will be met?

- a. Solicitations and publications of the Young Research Grants-in Aid Program (YRGAP), which is sponsored by the South Carolina Academy of Science (SCAS) will be increased.
- b. Providing workshops for teachers and students about the Middle and Elementary School Academy of Science (MESAS) and the South Carolina Junior Academy of Science (SCJAS) programs. These workshops are provided on a volunteer basis by mathematics and science faculty, who are members of the SCAS, from across the state.
- c. Collaborating with the SC State Department of Education in conjunction with the state's Mathematics and Science Centers in establishing a database of all middle and high school mathematics, science faculty and departments for the purpose of increasing the number of students and teachers reached.
- d. Publishing four editions of the SCJAS newsletter, which provides information on the Academy's activities and YRGAP.
- e. Expanding the South Carolina Junior Academy of Science (SCJAS) mailing list to include teachers, schools and students who have not historically participated in the Academy's activities.

- f. The number of travel grants to students that will support their attendance at MESAS, SCJAS, and SCAS workshops will be increased.
- g. The number of awards and prizes for meritorious research that is presented by students at the SCAS/SCJAS annual meeting will be increased.
- h. Continue to coordinate SCAS annual activities with the following programs offered within the state: Math Counts, SC Organization of Problem Solvers, DHEC Champions of the Environment, Clemson's Project KATE, and Newberry College's Science Olympiad and Quiz Bowl.
- i. Establishing one additional MESAS regional site and update & modernize MESAS Regions I, IV, & V.
- j. Workshops will be provided by the Academy. The workshops are designed to improve a student's ability to design, conduct, and evaluate scientific investigations. This plan will support the state's science curriculum standards.
- k. The number of teacher sponsors and observers at ISEF will be increased to support the students.
- l. A mechanism for students and teachers to share judging experiences at ISEF will be developed and initiated.
- m. The age at which students are allowed to participate at regional science fairs will be lowered.
- n. The number of SC regional science fairs that offer the Discovery Young Science Challenge awards to students in grades 5-8 will be increased where possible.
- o. A statewide initiative will be implemented for the purpose of raising additional funds from corporate and private sources that will be used to support awards and sustain this initiative.
- p. A cooperative arrangement with the State Museum and ETV that would provide for a number of activities that promote an understanding of the roles of science, mathematics, and engineering in the modern world will be developed and initiated.
- q. Representatives from existing MESAS regions will be recruited to provide assistance to these planning committees.
- r. The volunteer members of the SCAS in collaboration with volunteer members from MESAS, SCJAS, the state's institutions of higher learning (both private and public) four-year and technical colleges, staff members from among the state's Mathematics and Science Hubs and Teachers from across the state will provide a number of workshops and professional meetings over the course of a fiscal year that support the objective.

FY 2005–06 EIA Budget Request

EIA Program Name: Junior Academy of Science

1. FY 2004–05 Base Appropriation.

\$100,000 for 2004–05

2. FY 2005–06 Total Amount Requested and % Change over FY 2004–05 Base.

The amount requested is \$100,000, a 0% increase over the 2004–05 base.

3. Cost Estimates for Increase or Decrease in Funding for FY 2005–06. *(Identify how the requested increase or decrease in funding was calculated. For example, inflationary increases, program expansions, program reductions, changes in program objectives, etc., impact budgets. Please be specific.)*

N/A

4. Detailed justification for increase, decrease or maintenance of funding. *(Based upon the total budget request for Fiscal Year 2005–06, what would be the program objectives for this program? Explain how the proposed increase, decrease or maintenance of funding affects the current program or objectives.)*

Maintenance of funding is needed to meet program objectives and provide schools and students these opportunities:

- a. To increase the number of K–12 students, teachers, and schools, participating in science, mathematics, and engineering activities.
- b. To enhance the competitiveness of South Carolina students at the Annual International Science and Engineering Fairs (ISEF) (grades 9–12).
- c. To improve public understanding of and appreciation for the role of science, mathematics, and engineering in the state.
- d. To expand the MESAS program from four regions to five regions and to update and modernize Regions I, IV, and V.
- e. To provide mathematics and science teachers in the state with enrichment activities that can improve classroom effectiveness, promote professional growth, and promote the development of leadership skills.
- f. To expand our efforts with The State Museum and coordinate events with EdVenture children's museum.
- g. To complete the establishment of a journal for citizens of South Carolina from all levels of scientific involvement, from high school students to Nobel Prize winners, to publish their works, findings, and articles. The initial issue of the SCAS Journal is available online at www.sdacadsci.org. (No other such journal exists in South Carolina.)
- h. A statewide initiative will be implemented for the purpose of raising additional funds from corporate and private sources that will be used to support awards and sustain this initiative.

5. Detailed Justification for any additional FTEs Requested.

N/A

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
EIA	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0
Contributions, Foundation	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Other (Specify)	0	0	0	0
SCAS is non-profit (fees are absorbed in operations of the programs)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000

Expenditures	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2005-06 Estimated
Personal Service	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000
Supplies & Materials	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Contractual Services	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Equipment	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Student Programs	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000
# FTES:	*.5	*.5	*.5	*.5

* This program is administered at the University of South Carolina. Some program funds are used to support salary.