

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? (*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 2004–05 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 2004–05 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 2005 Advanced Placement Examinations was provided by The College Board to the Department of Education in August 26, 2005. The data reported below are from the report to the Department.

- Nearly 54 percent (54.1 percent) of South Carolina students scored three or higher on 2005 AP exams. In 2004, the number scoring three or higher was 55.6 percent. While the state was unable to meet its objective in this area, it is felt that the increase in the number of students taking the challenging and rigorous AP coursework is the most important factor.
- In 2005, 2,447 exams were taken by African American students, up 12.2% over the previous year. In 2004, 2,181 exams were taken by minority students.
- In 2005, 12,313 students took AP examinations, up from 10,988 students in 2004 and 10,646 in 2003.
- In 2005, 20,479 AP examinations were taken. This was the largest one-year gain over the past several years. In 2004, 18,044 AP examinations were taken, compared to 2003 (17,429) and 2002 (16,628).

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objectives of 2005–06 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 2005-06?

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 2005-06, will be met?

The Department has established the Office of High School Redesign to scale up its efforts in this area. Additional funds have been provided to the schools to support the purchase of materials and supplies targeted to improve AP instruction. Stronger partnerships with the College Board will result in additional professional development opportunities for state teachers and counselors. The Office of High School Design, working closely with the Office of School Quality, will work with schools to increase the use of data, particularly using AP Potential.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$2,633,814	\$2,514,265	\$3,078,265	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$39,467	\$160,983	\$113,766	0
TOTAL:	\$2,673,281	\$2,675,248	\$3,192,031	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	\$1,423,852	\$1,406,000	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$2,245,283	\$1,094,840	\$1,615,042	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
GSAH and GSSM	\$34,128	0	0	0
Colleges offering AP institutes	\$113,338	\$42,790	\$170,989	0
Budget Reduction	\$119,549	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$160,983	\$113,766	0	0
TOTAL:	\$2,673,281	\$2,675,248	\$3,192,031	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 objectives were as follows:

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

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

- All 85 school districts submitted three-year written plans for their gifted and talented programs. The plans were reviewed by three readers and written feedback was provided to each district. Two statewide technical assistance sessions and eight regional technical assistance sessions were offered to assist districts in writing their plan. Each district received print resources to assist them in developing their plan. Regional meetings were held to support the professional development of district coordinators. Also, regions collaborated on one professional development offering for teachers based upon locally identified needs. Federal funding supported these professional development offerings.
- Summary data for PACT through the spring 2004 administration was collected and reported. A longitudinal summary of performance of gifted and talented students on PACT is available (2000-04). This information can be found on the State Department's web page http://www.myscschools.com/Offices/CSO/Gifted_Talented/gt.htm. Presently there is no infrastructure to support collecting performance of gifted and talented students on AP or IB exams. The same is true for ACT/SAT with the additional barrier that parents pay for these assessments, and therefore requiring these data to be reported for purpose of assessing performance of gifted and talented students may raise legal issues related to privacy rights.

- 71,632 students were served in academic gifted and talented programs during the 2004-05 school year. This represents 13 percent of the state's enrollment in grades three through twelve. This is an increase of 329 students from the previous year.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Districts will prepare a year one written update on progress made on their three-year gifted and talented plan. These updates will be reviewed by the Department and by regional peer groups.
- The Department will support implementation of district plans, particularly in the areas of curriculum, professional development, and guidance/counseling.
- The Department will explore processes for gathering data concerning the performance of gifted and talented students on AP and IB exams that will not create a burden for the districts.

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 2005–06?

- A written update reporting each district's progress on year one of the gifted and talented plan will be submitted and reviewed.
- A plan and timeline for year two will be submitted and reviewed.
- Data on the performance of gifted and talented students on state assessments will be collected in the fall of 2006.
- Data on the performance of gifted and talented students on AP and IB will be collected provided a process is developed that does not create a reporting burden for districts.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- Districts will be offered state and regional support in the preparation of their year one update.
- Districts will be provided with professional development opportunities to support needs in curriculum and in guidance/counseling.
- Regional groups to support district leadership of gifted and talented programs will continue to meet quarterly.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$29,497,533	\$29,497,533	\$29,497,533	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	\$2,346	\$2,346	0
TOTAL:	\$29,497,533	\$29,499,879	\$29,499,879	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	\$11,687	0	0
Contractual Services	\$456,785	\$472,117	\$459,131	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	\$12,000	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$28,062,877	\$28,547,533	\$28,740,748	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Other Entities/State Agencies	0	\$164,273	0	
Jr. Academy Science Proviso	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	0
Teacher Training	\$123,940	\$189,923	\$200,000	0
Budget Reduction	751,585	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$2,346	\$2,346	0	0
TOTAL:	\$29,497,533	\$29,499,879	\$29,499,879	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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 691 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 2005–06? 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 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 2005-06?

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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Program monitoring and the timely distribution of funds.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$3,955,017	\$3,955,017	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
SC Autism Society	\$238,653	\$250,000	\$250,000	0
Budget Reduction	\$11,347	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,105,017	\$4,205,017	\$4,205,017	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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, 2004–05, 9,795 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, 8,800 were administered the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT). Out of the qualifying pool, a total of 4,609 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, five camps were sponsored by the following colleges and universities: Clemson University, Benedict College, University of South Carolina, Claflin University, and the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics. The camps offered a wide variety of opportunities including programs such as architecture, 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 2005–06? 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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History:

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$0
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	0	0	0	0
Other Entities	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Other Agencies	\$12,188	\$15,000	\$15,000	0
Colleges and University Grants	\$55,695	\$43,020	\$28,635	0
Governor's School	0	\$18,000	\$14,385	0
Transfer	\$110,048	\$104,378	\$114,189	0
Budget Reduction	\$1,701	\$2,340	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$805	\$50	0	0
TOTAL:	\$231,956	\$231,956	\$223,767	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Tech Prep

Program Director: Dr. Bob Couch

Telephone: 803-734-8410

Fax: 803-734-3525

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Objectives:

- a. The number of students participating in School-to-Work (STW) activities will increase by 1%.
- b. 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%.
- c. The number of partnerships developed with local businesses will increase by 2%.
- d. The number of career and technology education courses articulated with postsecondary education will increase by 3%.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. The number of students participating in School-to-Work (STW) activities will increase by 1%.
- b. 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%.
- c. The number of partnerships developed with local businesses will increase by 1%.
- d. The number of career and technology education courses articulated with postsecondary education will increase by 1%.

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 2005-06?

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 2005–06, 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$4,257,742	\$4,064,483	\$4,064,483	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$150	\$150	\$188	0
TOTAL:	\$4,257,892	\$4,064,633	\$4,064,671	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$4,064,483	\$4,064,445	\$4,064,671	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$193,109	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	150	188	\$0	0
TOTAL:	\$4,257,742	\$4,064,633	\$4,064,671	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Arts Curricula

Program Director: R. Scot Hockman

Telephone: 803-734-0323

Fax: 803-734-6142

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(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*. Funds were used to promote the development and implementation of appropriate curricula, instruction, and assessment. 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. The grants provided funding for schools and districts to implement large and small-scale arts initiatives to support quality educational programs in the arts that significantly improve student achievement.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

Students from 28 schools (representing 19 districts) were served through the Art Curricular Grant fund. Additional monies supported professional development institutes for visual and performing arts teachers, administrators, and classroom teachers. A total of 392 teachers from 46 districts were involved in 10 different summer arts institutes. These ranged in topics that included new teacher training, standards implementation, curriculum writing, classroom and program assessment, statistical analysis, arts integration, and technology.

The South Carolina Arts Assessment Project continued into its fourth year of testing fourth grade students in music and visual arts. Among the 13 schools in 13 districts where students were tested 3732 children took the music test and 2309 children took the visual arts test.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 2005–06?

All professional development activities are required to include an evaluation component. A synthesis of the participant evaluations is shared with the program contact. The Office of Program Evaluation at the University of South Carolina College of Education is preparing a comprehensive analysis of this year's fourth grade arts assessment test results.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Each Arts Curricular Grant 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.

In addition, exemplary district and school Arts Curricular Distinguished Arts Program Grants will be published on-line in order to set the standard for model arts programs.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$1,597,584	\$1,597,584	\$1,597,584	\$0
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	\$15,643	\$15,643	\$15,643	0
Aid to Other Entities	\$475	\$475	\$475	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$163,038	\$186,890	385,308	0
TOTAL:	\$1,776,740	\$1,800,592	\$1,999,010	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	\$18	0	0
Contractual Services	0	\$8,125	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	\$275	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$1,500,486	\$1,354,066	\$1,999,010	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Aid to Other Entities/State Agencies	\$73,246	\$52,800	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$186,890	\$385,308	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,760,622	\$1,800,592	\$1,999,010	\$ 0
# FTES:	1	1	1	

FY 2005–06 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 were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Objectives:

- a. 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.
- b. 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%.
- c. 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.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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. The total amount of funds (\$8,703.066) was distributed to all school districts based on the plan to expend funds in each district's local plan.
- b. The percentage of CTE students achieving an average of at least a 2.0 on final grades was 90.5%.
- c. The percentage of CTE completers placed was 97.8%.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. 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.

- b. 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 increased to 95.0%. This percentage is calculated over a 3-year period of time.

The percentage for objective #b increased by 1.5%.

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 2005-06?

Data will be collected from all school districts and career centers to calculate the measures above.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, will be met?

Schools 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$4,151,978	\$3,963,520	\$3,963,520	\$0
General Fund	\$4,848,022	\$4,739,548	\$4,739,548	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	\$0	0
TOTAL:	\$9,000,000	\$8,703,068	\$8,703,068	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$8,762,972	\$8,703,066	\$8,703,068	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$237,028	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$2	0	0
TOTAL:	\$9,000,000	\$8,703,068	\$8,703,068	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: PL 99-457 Preschool Children 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 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

To ensure that preschool students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE).

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 FAPE for 11,668 preschool students with disabilities.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for this program have not changed.

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 2005-06?

Timely distribution of funds and monitoring activities.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Program monitoring along with other General Supervision activities.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	0	0	\$3,973,584	\$0
General Fund	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	\$3,973,584	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Adult and Community Education

Program Director: Cherry Daniel

Telephone: 803-734-8075

Fax: 803-734-3643

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the state's adult education program is to help produce a more literate, more informed, and more productive South Carolina. Adult education allows adults to complete their high school education and to acquire the credentials they need to compete in the job market or to pursue further schooling.

- Twelve educational functioning performance measures were set and approved by the federal Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 Office of Adult and Community Education was formally audited by the federal OVAE in 2003-04. An "all clear" status was received during the 2004-05 school year (June 22, 2005) indicating that all required actions were satisfactorily met.
- 84,796 students were served in the adult education program during the 2003-04 school year. 76,120 students were served in the program during the 2004-05 school year. This 10% decrease is a result of the program complying with requirements from the OVAE audit.
- The performance measures for the 2004-05 school year have not been calculated at this time and will be prepared in time for the December 31, 2005 submission to OVAE.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- All adult education programs will receive an allocation from the \$1.6 million dollar state proviso to serve students ages 17-21. They are encouraged to hire a counselor/job coach/transition specialist to help this population complete their high school credential and be better prepared to move into higher education, the military or the work force.
- The state of South Carolina received Title I Incentive Funds for meeting the performance measures set by adult education, vocational education, and commerce. A significant portion of these funds will be used to implement WorkKeys testing and remediation in each adult education center.
- Vocational Rehabilitation students will continue to be served through the Project LEO grant. This is the second year of this grant that focuses on reading instruction for low-level readers.

- English as a Second Language (ESL) students will be served through an additional grant received from the federal government.

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 2005-06?

- One-third of the programs are formally assessed each year for compliance with state and federal regulations.
- Data on the performance of adult education students is gathered quarterly and will be aggregated at the end of the school year.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, will be met?

- Programs receive state and regional training focused on the most pressing needs of the students/programs.
- Programs will be provided with up to date research and information on program enhancement and improvement ideas.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$12,677,703	\$0
General Fund	\$13,482,944	\$13,187,637	\$509,934	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
Budget Reduction	(\$138,410)	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$13,344,534	\$13,187,637	\$13,187,637	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$12,933,629	\$13,112,788	\$13,112,788	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Aid to State Agencies	\$410,905	\$74,849	\$74,849	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$13,344,534	\$13,187,637	\$13,187,637	\$ 0
# FTES:	1	1	1	

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Alternative School Program

Program Director: Aveene R. Coleman

Telephone: 803-734-3057

Fax: 803-734-3043

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? (*The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.*)

The mission of the Alternative School Program is to provide appropriate services to students who for behavioral or academic reasons are not benefiting from the regular school program or they are interfering with the learning of others. The program objectives for FY 2004-05 were to:

- a. provide technical assistance to school districts in the development and implementation of alternative school programs' best practices' and,
- b. provide professional development opportunities for alternative school program educators.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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."*)

All objectives established for 2004-05 were met.

- a. During the 2004–05 school year 3,319 students were served in alternative school programs across the state.
- b. Technical assistance visits were conducted at twenty-eight (28) alternative school programs during the 2004–2005 school year. Programs received feedback regarding their implementation the program. An *Alternative School Handbook* was developed to assist alternative school directors with development and implementation of their programs. Twelve (12) new alternative school directors were provided additional technical assistance at the New Alternative School Directors' Meeting held on October 28, 2004.
- c. A one-day workshop was presented for twenty-nine (29) alternative school directors on March 17, 2005, which addressed the following topics: behavior modification techniques, parental involvement techniques, working with at-risk students, and working with the reluctant learner.
- d. Two one-day workshops were presented for seventy-four (74) alternative school educators (teachers and directors) on June 10th and June 16th, 2005 which addressed the following topics: differentiating instruction and working with at-risk students.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective will remain the same for the FY 2005-06.

- a. To provide alternative school programs for students who for behavioral or academic reasons are not benefiting from the regular school programs or are interfering with the learning of others.
- b. Provide technical assistance to school districts in the development and implementation of alternative schools programs.
- c. Provide professional development opportunities for alternative school program educators.

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 2005-06?

Data from the *Alternative Schools Programs' End of Year Reports*, and *Workshop Surveys* 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 2005–06, will be met?

Alternative school programs will continue to be monitored. Best practices will be shared with alternative school programs to support development and implementation of their programs.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$ 0	\$10,976,277	\$0
General Fund	\$10,976,277	\$10,976,277	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,976,277	\$10,976,277	\$10,976,277	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	10,356,556	\$10,718,157	\$10,976,277	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Transfer to Part-time Health/Dental Benefits	0	\$56,341	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	619,721	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,976,277	\$10,774,498	\$10,976,277	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Excellence in Middle Schools Initiative

Program Director: Kimberly W. Smith

Telephone: 803-734-8101

Fax: 803-734-4458

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The purpose of the Excellence in Middle Schools Initiative is to fund guidance counselors, school safety officers and/or school nurses in middle/junior high schools. The program objectives for 2004-05 were as follows:

- Ensure schools are safe, healthy places with environments that are conducive for learning;
- Maintain or increase the number of guidance counselors in middle/junior high schools;
- Maintain or increase the number of nurses in middle/junior high schools and;
- Maintain or increase the number of school resource officers in middle/junior high schools

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

- Districts will hire and sustain personnel that support a drug free environment for students
- Based on No Child Left Behind there are no Persistently Dangerous (PDS) middle/junior high schools or middle/junior high schools at risk of becoming PDS.
- The number of school guidance counselors increased in the 2004-005 school year. In 2004-05 there were 1,770; In 2003-04 there were 1,731; In 2002-03 there were 1,746; In 2001-02 there were 1,751; and in 2000-01 there were 1,727 guidance counselors.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- No change

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 2005-06?

- The number of Persistently Dangerous or at risk of becoming persistently dangerous schools;
- The number of school guidance counselors in middle/junior high schools
- The number of school nurses in middle/junior high schools
- The number of school resources officers in middle/junior high schools.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- Continue to monitor performance measures
- Continue to provide training and technical assistance to school resources offices, guidance counselors and nurses

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$4,937,500	\$0
General Fund	\$5,000,000	\$4,937,500	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	0	0	0	0
Aid to other entities	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,000,000	\$4,937,500	\$4,937,500	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 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	\$5,000,000	\$4,937,500	\$4,937,500	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,000,000	\$4,937,500	\$4,937,500	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Increased High School Diploma Requirements

Program Director: Harvey Chapman

Telephone: 803-734-8340

Fax: 803-734-6225

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

Beginning with the ninth-grade class of 1997-98, the number of units required for the state high school diploma was increased from twenty units to twenty-four units. This included the addition of one unit each of mathematics, science, computer science, and foreign language or in an occupational specialty. The objectives were:

- Require twenty-four units for the state high school diploma
- To distribute allocated funds to the districts on a monthly basis to be expended for salaries, employee benefits, technology equipment, and instructional supplies

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

There were 29,923 students graduating with twenty-four units during the implementation year of 2000–01. The 2004–05 class contained 32,204 students meeting the graduation requirement. Eighty-four local school districts used allocated funds for employee salaries, benefits, instructional supplies, and equipment.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective for 2005–06 will continue to require twenty-four units for the high school diploma.

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 2005-06?

The annual graduation data maintained by the Office of School Quality will be used as the data source.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

The Office of School Quality will use a body of accreditation standards that includes components for assessing the requirements for the state high school diploma.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$23,632,801	\$0
General Fund	\$23,931,950	\$23,632,801	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$23,931,950	\$23,632,801	\$23,632,801	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$23,931,950	\$23,632,801	\$23,632,801	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$23,931,950	\$23,632,801	\$23,632,801	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: High Schools That Work (HSTW)/Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)

Program Director: Dr. Bob Couch

Telephone: 803-734-8410

Fax: 803-734-3525

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- a. Provide technical assistance to one third of the state's one hundred (100) sites as stated in the memorandum of understanding with existing *HSTW/MMGW* sites.
- b. Provide technical assistance relative to sites interested in joining the initiatives. Approximately forty sites indicated such interest.
- c. Provide two workshops to interpret NAEP assessment data and establish initiative benchmarks.
- d. Provide a New Site Development Conference at the 2005 Education and Business Summit for sites joining the initiative.
- e. Provide professional development opportunities at the Education and Business Summit for educators at new and existing sites.
- f. Increase the number of *HSTW/MMGW* sites in South Carolina.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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. Yes, all objectives established for 2004-05 were MET. Technical Assistance Visits (TAVs) were conducted at thirty-four (34) sites during the 2004-05 school year. Each site was provided with a technical assistance visit report for use in further initiative implementation. TAV teams composed of 12-15 members from other *HSTW/MMGW* sites conducted three-day visits in order to provide data-driven feedback to each initiative site.
- b. Telephone and written communications were conducted between the South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Career and Technology Education and approximately forty (40) potential new sites. Twenty-five of those sites did join the initiative in December 2004. Much of this communication dealt with processing applications, answering questions about the initiatives, etc.
- c. National Assessment of Educational Performance (NAEP) assessment and benchmarking workshops were held for all forty (40) *HSTW/MMGW* sites that were assessed in 2004. Separate sessions were held for *HSTW* and *MMGW* sites.
- d. New Site Development Conferences were conducted in June 2005 for all new sites that joined the initiative in November 2004. Thirteen high school and twelve middle school sites sent teams of eight to ten individuals to the 2005 Education and Business Summit for SREB-led professional development resulting in the construction of site action plans for all new sites. Each of the twenty-five new sites were required to develop site action plans in order to support successful initiative implementation.

- e. Concurrent sessions and focus presentations were included in the 2005 Education and Business Summit programming to support the professional growth and development of educators at both new and existing whole school reform sites.
- f. We did add a total of twenty-five (25) new sites in December 2004. Those thirteen (13) high schools and twelve (12) middle school sites used funding provided through the Office of Career and Technology Education from lottery funds to provide professional development and purchase materials for faculty and staff in preparation for the New Site Development Conference conducted at the Education and Business Summit in June 2005.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. Provide technical assistance to one third of the state's one hundred (100) sites as stated in the memorandum of understanding with existing *HSTW/MMGW* sites.
- b. Provide technical assistance relative to sites interested in joining the initiatives. Approximately forty sites indicated such interest.
- c. Provide two workshops to interpret NAEP assessment data and establish initiative benchmarks.
- d. Provide a New Site Development Conference at the 2005 Education and Business Summit for sites joining the initiative.
- e. Provide professional development opportunities at the Education and Business Summit for educators at new and existing sites.
- f. Increase the number of *HSTW/MMGW* sites in South Carolina.
- g. Manage the whole school reform initiatives (*HSTW/MMGW*) in a manner that will promote effective implementation and adequate technical assistance for new sites.

The addition of objective (G) is necessary because of the focus on whole school reform in the recently passed South Carolina Education and Economic Development Act. All high schools in South Carolina must implement a whole school reform model that addresses the ten key practices as established by the *HSTW* model by the 2009–2010 school 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 2005-06?

All current sites will give the NAEP assessment in the spring of 2006, and the data collected from those assessments will enable sites to assess their site's benchmarking goals as well as determine the appropriate professional development agendas for their schools. Composite NAEP assessment data will enable state leadership to formulate strategies to address systemic strengths and target needed technical assistance. We will continue to require memoranda of understanding agreements with our sites and provide technical assistance as detailed in those agreements. All applications received in November 2005 will be reviewed and assessed for indicators of commitment to the reform initiatives and completeness of the applications. All new sites will receive an initiative orientation in December and will be required to develop a site leadership team to send to the 2006 Education and Business Summit for the New Site Development Conference.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

We began the 2005–2006 school year with two additional education associates supporting these whole school reform models/initiatives. Under their leadership the Office of Career and Technology Education will formulate Technical Assistance Visit (TAV) teams to lead the required TAVs for the 2005–2006 school year and will provide leadership for those teams. NAEP assessment materials will be ordered for all current initiative sites and appropriate technical assistance will be delivered to those sites in order that testing/assessments will be conducted efficiently. Summit planning will be developed to include New Site Development Planning for sites joining the initiatives in 2005 and concurrent session strands for both *HSTW* and *MMGW*.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	\$500,000	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	1,055	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$500,000	\$1,001,055	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$7,700	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	0	\$86,964	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	\$3,509	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	\$400,010	\$1,001,055	0
Employer Contributions	0	\$762	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
TAV team travel, testing	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	1,055	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$500,000	\$1,001,055	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Young Adult Education Program (YAP)

Program Director: Cherry Daniel

Telephone: 803-734-8075

Fax: 803-734-3643

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the state's adult education program is to help produce a more literate, more informed, and more productive South Carolina. Adult education allows adults to complete their high school education and to acquire the credentials they need to compete in the job market or to pursue further schooling.

- Twelve educational functioning performance measures were set and approved by the federal Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

Program did not exist for Fiscal Year 2004-05.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- All adult education programs will receive an allocation from the \$1.6 million dollar state proviso to serve students ages 17-21. They are encouraged to hire a counselor/job coach/transition specialist to help this population complete their high school credential and be better prepared to move into higher education, the military or the work force.
- The state of South Carolina received Title I Incentive Funds for meeting the performance measures set by adult education, vocational education, and commerce. A significant portion of these funds will be used to implement WorkKeys testing and remediation in each adult education center.
- Vocational Rehabilitation students will continue to be served through the Project LEO grant. This is the second year of this grant that focuses on reading instruction for low-level readers.
- English as a Second Language (ESL) students will be served through an additional grant received from the federal government.

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 2005-06?

- One-third of the programs are formally assessed each year for compliance with state and federal regulations.
- Data on the performance of adult education students is gathered quarterly and will be aggregated at the end of the school year.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, will be met?

- Programs receive state and regional training focused on the most pressing needs of the students/programs.
- Programs will be provided with up to date research and information on program enhancement and improvement ideas.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$1,600,000	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,600,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	0	0	\$1,600,000	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,600,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Student Testing

Program Director: Teri Siskind

Telephone: 803-734-8298

Fax: 803-734-8527

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the Office of Assessment is to select or develop and administer high quality assessments of educational attainment that provide reliable information that can be used as the basis for drawing valid conclusions about examinees and that meet the highest standards of the educational measurement profession.

- a. Administer the South Carolina Readiness Assessment to students in Kindergarten and first grade to determine their readiness for first and second grade as mandated by the EAA.
- b. Administer the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT) in mathematics, English language arts, science and social studies to students in grades three through eight.
- c. Administer the PACT-Alt and HSAP-Alt and begin development of the new alternate assessment.
- d. Administer the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) in mathematics and English language arts to students in grades ten, eleven, twelve, and to adult education students.
- e. Administer the examinations for the High School End-of-course Examination Program (EOCEP) to students taking gateway or benchmark courses, which currently include Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2, English 1, Physical Science, Biology 1/Applied Biology 2. Pilot an electronic version of the examinations.
- f. Provide three administrations of the Basic Skills Assessment Program.
- g. Administer state-developed performance assessments as a part of the process to assist in the identification of students for participation in programs for the gifted and talented as specified in Regulation 43-220.
- h. Ensure the administration of the PSAT or the PLAN to students in the tenth grade.
- i. Release the new NCS Mentor software program. Sample mathematics and English language arts (ELA) constructed-response and extended-response items and student responses for the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) will be included.
- j. Conduct sessions in 2004–05 to train district test coordinators in the administration of the PACT, HSAP, EOCEP, PACT-Alt and HSAP-Alt.
- k. Participate in the Technical Issues in Large-scale Assessment Consortium.
- l. Conduct Technical Advisory Committee meetings.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004–05 school year approximately 41,100 Kindergarten and 42,100 first grade students participated in the South Carolina Readiness Assessment.
- b. In spring 2005 a total of 1,209,229 PACT English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies tests were administered to students in grades three through eight.

Subject	Grade	Number Tested	% Meeting Standard
English language arts	3	46,710	87.1
	4	47,204	79.6
	5	47,756	76.8
	6	50,042	63.5
	7	51,014	71.5
	8	50,354	74.7
Mathematics	3	48,047	83.4
	4	48,485	78.6
	5	48,972	77.2
	6	50,893	78.7
	7	51,745	71.5
	8	50,703	66.3
Science	3	49,682	64.4
	4	49,809	61.8
	5	50,442	56.7
	6	52,605	56.2
	7	53,528	61.7
	8	52,607	60.0
Social Studies	3	49,713	79.4
	4	49,800	77.2
	5	50,455	63.9
	6	52,605	64.9
	7	53,490	58.7
	8	52,568	66.5

- c. In 2004–05, 1,485 students participated in the PACT-Alt and 314 students participated in the HSAP-Alt. Development of the new alternate assessment began.
- d. The HSAP English language arts assessment was administered to 9,158 students and the HSAP mathematics assessment was administered to 11,420 students in the fall of 2004. In the spring of 2005, the HSAP English language arts assessment was administered to 56,309 students and the HSAP mathematics assessment was administered to 58,481 students.
- e. In 2004–05, the EOCEP Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2 was administered to 58,017 students. English 1 examinations were administered to 56,010 students. Physical Science examinations were administered to 45,817 students. Biology 1/Applied Biology 2 examinations were administered to 37,233 students. An electronic version of the examinations was piloted and 3,520 students participated in the pilot.
- f. The final administrations of the BSAP Exit Examination took place in 2004–05. Mathematics examinations were administered to 7,063 students. Reading examinations were administered to 5,996 students. Writing examinations were administered to 4,987 students.

- g. In 2004–05, performance assessments were administered to 16,528 students as a part of the process to assist in the identification of students for participation in programs for the gifted and talented.
- h. In 2004–05, the PSAT was administered to 29,265 students in the tenth grade and the PLAN was administered to 12,573 students in the tenth grade.
- i. The new NCS Mentor software program was released in late December. The program provides sample mathematics and English language arts (ELA) constructed-response and extended-response items and student responses for the High School Assessment Program (HSAP).
- j. Workshops were conducted in 2004–05 to train district test coordinators from each school district in the administration of the PACT, HSAP, EOCEP, PACT-Alt, and HSAP-Alt.
- k. In 2004–05, Office of Assessment staff participated in meetings of the Technical Issues in Large-scale Assessment Consortium in October, January, and June.
- l. Technical Advisory Committee meetings were held in June and November.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. Administer the South Carolina Readiness Assessment to students in Kindergarten and first grade to determine their readiness for first and second grade as mandated by the EAA.
- b. Administer the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT) in mathematics, English language arts, science and social studies to students in grades three through eight.
- c. Administer the PACT-Alt and HSAP-Alt and continue development of the new alternate assessment (SC-Alt).
- d. Administer the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) in mathematics and English language arts to students in grades ten, eleven, twelve, and to adult education students.
- e. Administer the examinations for the High School End-of-course Examination Program (EOCEP) to students taking gateway or benchmark courses. Proceed with development of electronic versions of the examinations. Proceed with development of an examination for U.S. History and Constitution.
- f. Administer state-developed performance assessments as a part of the process to assist in the identification of students for participation in programs for the gifted and talented as specified in Regulation 43-220.
- g. Ensure the administration of the PSAT or the PLAN to students in the tenth grade.
- h. Conduct sessions in 2005–06 to train district test coordinators in the administration of the PACT, HSAP, EOCEP, PACT-Alt, HSAP-Alt and SC-Alt.
- i. Participate in the Technical Issues in Large-scale Assessment Consortium. Participation in TILSA provides opportunities for members to share expertise, and network on technical issues. Participate in SCASS projects for LEP, Early Childhood, and Students with Disabilities.
- j. Conduct meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee.

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 2005–06?

The numbers of tests administered for each assessment will be reported as the effectiveness measure of this program.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- a. Contracts for statewide assessments will be closely monitored and documentation of progress will be maintained through monthly activity reports, conference calls, and meetings.
- b. Workshops will be held for school district personnel.
- c. Office of Assessment staff will participate in the CCSSO consortia.
- d. Conduct meetings with assessment experts serving on the Technical Advisory Committees.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$876,686	\$1,211,544	\$17,714,418	\$0
General Fund	\$15,011,249	\$13,221,950	\$207,005	0
Lottery	0	\$2,717,662	0	0
Fees	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	0	0
Grant - Federal	\$6,042,595	\$6,178,684	\$6,309,439	0
Contributions, Foundation	0	0	0	0
Other Agencies	0	0	0	0
Other Entities	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$6,583,996	\$3,535,446	\$6,453,167	0
TOTAL:	\$28,514,526	\$26,865,286	\$30,684,029	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$774,803	\$1,247,608	\$1,309,617	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$11,335	\$15,683	\$13,000	0
Contractual Services	\$21,848,500	\$18,847,219	\$24,063,082	0
Equipment	\$10,089	\$19,102	\$4,000	0
Fixed Charges	\$34,943	\$49,435	\$21,000	0
Travel	\$12,141	\$11,107	\$5,110	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	\$223	\$2,000	0
Employer Contributions	\$117,983	\$126,537	\$92,120	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Federal Indirect	\$208,273	\$94,138	\$250,608	0
Budget Reduction	\$2,175,584	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$3,320,875	\$6,454,234	\$4,923,492	0
TOTAL:	\$28,514,526	\$26,865,286	\$30,684,029	\$ 0
# FTES:	27	30	32	

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Institute of Reading

Program Director: Pamela S. Wills

Telephone: 803-734-8391

Fax: 803-734-6142

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The program objective for Fiscal Year 2004–05 was to implement year 2 of the South Carolina Reading Initiative in the Middle Grades (SCRI-MG Phase One).

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 second year of training to 27 literacy coaches from 23 districts and 36 middle schools during August 2004 through June 2005. Literacy coaches participated in two graduate courses in language and literacy (coaching and assessment) taught 2-3 days each month. A third course, Writing in the Middle School, was taught over three weeks in June.

During year 2 of the initiative, literacy coaches began full-time coaching in their schools. They worked with teachers in their classrooms, conducting demonstration lessons and modeling best practice strategies for teachers. Coaches also began conducting faculty study groups with interested teachers and administrators. These groups met twice a month after school to study best practices in reading and writing. 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 May 2005, the end of year 2 of the initiative, to determine literacy coach ratings on the effectiveness of SCRI-MG. The following tables represent the most recent data analyzed from the August 2004 survey. Note: 2005 data will be posted to the CSO web page summarizing the 2005 data collected:

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 2005-06? 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 2 of the SCRI-MG (Phase One) initiative and to implement year 1 of the new SCRI-MG (Phase Two) initiative, which began in August 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 2005-06?

Both an end-of-the-year survey and the SCRI Reading Profile will be used to assess the effectiveness of SCRI-MG Phases 1 –2 during the Fiscal Year 2005–06.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, 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 FY2005–06 are met.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$1,312,874	\$1,312,874	\$1,312,874	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$777,312	\$506,890	\$257,034	0
TOTAL:	\$2,090,186	\$1,819,764	\$1,569,908	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$52,689	\$26,971	\$33,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$91,044	\$48,833	\$117,034	0
Contractual Services	\$108,169	\$106,104	\$165,000	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	\$17,698	\$14,752	\$500	0
Travel	\$10,380	\$5,770	\$105,000	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$1,167,361	\$1,264,169	\$800,000	0
Employer Contributions	\$570	0	\$825	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Other Entities	4,000	25,000	\$5,000	0
Allocations to Other Agencies	71,794	71,131	\$343,549	0
Budget Reduction	59,591	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$506,890	\$257,034	0	0
TOTAL:	\$2,090,186	\$1,819,764	\$1,569,908	\$ 0
# FTES:	*3	*3	*3	

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

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Instructional Materials (Free Textbook Program)

Program Director: Jim White (Finance); Kriss Stewart (Adoptions)

Telephone: 803-253-4188; 803-734-8393

Fax: 803-253-6130; 803-734-4480

E-mail: jwhite@sde.state.sc.us; kstewart@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the Instructional Materials Program is to administer the Free Basal Textbook Enabling Act, cited in Title 59 Chapter 31 of the South Carolina Code of Laws and State Board of Education Regulation 43-71. The definition of textbooks as used in the act was broadened to include other instructional materials. Instructional materials are currently provided in all K–12 subject areas.

Program functions or objectives include:

- Issue the 2005 Call for Bids in subject areas approved by the State Board of Education.
- Contract with publishers to provide quality materials adopted by the State Board of Education.
- Maintain an on-line ordering system providing schools real-time access to 5,000 plus items.
- Coordinate an annual physical inventory of all state owned materials used by schools and assess schools and districts for lost and damaged textbook fees.
- Assess publishers and vendors liquidated damages for late shipments.
- Assist district adoptions by providing a venue (annual instructional materials caravan) for reviewing instructional materials and textbook selections.
- Verify publisher compliance with Most Favored Purchaser provision in Title 59 Chapter 31.
- Provide training and technical assistance to districts and schools.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.

- Publishers and vendors submitted bids in State Board of Education 25 approved subject areas to replace textbooks in use for six years or longer.
- The State Board of Education approved for adoption 1,579 recent copyrighted textbooks and instructional materials that are aligned with the latest South Carolina Academic Standards.
- Public schools placed 7,209 orders for textbooks and other instructional materials using the on-line ordering system.
- More than 1,100 schools conducted an annual physical inventory of textbooks and other instructional materials in 2003–04 and paid \$1,157,038 in fees for lost and damaged textbooks.
- Publishers were assessed \$72,438 in liquidated damages for late textbook shipments.
- Program staff conducted an annual Most Favored Purchaser price review and verification and publishers reimbursed the state \$4,251 for price violations identified in the review.

- 1,221 teachers and administrators attended a textbook caravan at 11 statewide sites to review textbooks and other instructional materials adopted by the State Board of Education.
- 108 District Textbook Coordinators and other school and district staff attended a meeting to receive information concerning new adoptions, ordering procedures, and allocations for instructional materials.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Issue the 2006 Call for Bids in subject areas approved by the State Board of Education.
- Contract with publishers to provide quality materials adopted by the State Board of Education.
- Maintain an on-line ordering system providing schools real-time access to 5,000 plus items.
- Coordinate an annual physical inventory of all state owned materials used by schools and assess schools and districts for lost and damaged textbook fees.
- Assess publishers and vendors liquidated damages for late shipments.
- Assist district adoptions by providing a venue (annual instructional materials caravan) for reviewing instructional materials textbook selections.
- Verify publisher compliance with Most Favored Purchaser provision in Title 59 Chapter 31.
- Provide training and technical assistance to districts and schools.

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 2005-06?

Same as 2004–05.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Deadlines for meeting objectives will be met.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$12,278,783	\$0
General Fund	\$38,357,042	\$37,498,804	\$37,498,804	0
Lottery	0	\$4,867,395	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$38,357,042	\$42,366,199	\$49,777,587	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$35,705,886	\$40,108,285	\$49,777,587	0
Contractual Services	\$281,077	\$327,417	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$1,986,509	\$1,930,497	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain - Transfer	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$383,570	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$38,357,042	\$42,366,199	\$49,777,587	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Grant Program

Program Director: James Bryan

Telephone: 803-734-0322

Fax: 803-734-5953

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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 2004–05 school year, a total of 389 grants were awarded out of 726 applications. Grant awards ranged from \$2,000 to \$6,000 for a total of \$1.278 million dollars. According to year-end reports, these grants impacted more than 2,700 teachers/administrators and 53,00 students.

Objective 1. During the period 2000–05, all districts have had one or more teachers receive a grant. At least one teacher from 65 of the 85 districts submitted a proposal for the 2004–05 school year.

Objective 2. The grant selection criteria were revised. 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 2005–06? 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 2005–06?

- 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. The number of funded grants that focus on the implementation of the academic standards.
- d. The number of grants disseminated statewide (products and methodologies) and public recognition of the program.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, 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 with the possibility to apply using a paper application in some instances.
- c. Continue to provide instructions and training to professional teacher groups and district staff on the grant process.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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*	\$1,275,343	\$1,272,166	\$1,272,166	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$61,197	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$11,701	\$14,878	\$14,878	0
TOTAL:	\$1,348,241	\$1,287,044	\$1,287,044	\$ 0
# FTES:	** .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 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: After-school/Homework Center Programs

Program Director: Sabrina B. Moore

Telephone: 803-734-5804

Fax: 803-734-2034

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The provisions of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-1910 (Supp. 2000, and Proviso 1.66), authorize the Department of Education to “allocate after-school program/homework center funds first, by establishing an equitable base amount for unsatisfactory schools; second, by establishing an equitable base amount for below average schools, and third, by allocating any remaining funds based on the ADM of below average schools.”

In addition to providing funding, the goal of program was to raise academic standards of students in schools identified as unsatisfactory and below average by the next academic school year.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 fiscal year 2004-05 objectives were met. The number of unsatisfactory schools using funds allocated by the General Assembly to operate after-school homework centers decreased by 56%, from 39 to 22.

Twenty-eight of the 137 schools listed as below average for the 04-05 academic year improved the absolute rating and were, therefore, removed from the list.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective of this program is to continue to provide funding for after-school homework programs to schools identified as unsatisfactory and below average as a means of assisting schools in raising the academic standards of students who attend these schools.

For FY 05-06, an additional objective was added: “By November 1 of the fiscal year, schools receiving funds for homework centers must report to the Department of Education and to the Education Oversight Committee on changes in the PACT-English Language Arts scores in both reading and writing of students who were participants in the homework centers during the prior school 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 2005–06?

The number of schools identified as unsatisfactory and below average according to the report card rating, as well as the number of students whose PACT-ELA scores improved.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Each school that has received a rating of unsatisfactory or below average will receive an adequate level of funding to operate an after-school homework program. Additionally, each school receiving funds must code the students who participate in the after-school homework center in SASixp so that the SDE can retrieve the information necessary for reporting purposes.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$2,067,936	\$0	\$6,810,000	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	\$1,548,440	\$6,953,864	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) – Transfer In	\$1,586,137	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	2,787	\$2,787	\$53,777	0
TOTAL:	\$5,205,300	\$6,956,651	\$6,863,777	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	\$18,500	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$5,092,946	\$6,668,864	\$6,378,777	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Proviso Allocation	0	\$234,009	\$485,000	0
Budget Reduction	\$93,854	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$53,778	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,205,300	\$6,956,651	\$6,863,777	\$ 0
# FTES	0	0	0	0

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Teacher Specialist On-Site

Program Director: Marsha Johnson

Telephone: 803-734-0923

Fax: 803-734-8297

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- Identify, select, place, train, and support a pool of exemplary educators with histories of raising student academic achievement to serve as Teacher Specialists On-Site to help classroom teachers improve teaching and learning
- Reduce the number of schools rated as Unsatisfactory over a two-year period
- Survey results of staff in schools receiving teacher specialists will show positive impact of teacher specialists

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 Fiscal Year 2004–05 objectives were met.

During the 2004–05 academic year, 198 Teacher Specialists served 73 schools in 33 districts.

The number of schools rated as Unsatisfactory decreased from 40 schools to 22 schools in 2004. 2005 results will be available in November 2005.

Survey results indicate 95 to 98% positive impact of teacher specialists.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives remain the same for 2005–06.

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 2005–06?

- The same measures and data as 2004–05 will be used for 2005–06.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- Potential candidates for the program will be recruited through newspaper ads, regional drop-ins, and mail-outs.
- Regular training sessions will be offered to Teacher Specialists.
- The work of Teacher Specialists will be monitored by monthly on-site visits. SDE staff will review schedules, logs, and other documentation and observe teacher specialists at work.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$13,199,637	\$0	\$15,087,776	\$0
General Fund	\$5,314,831	\$5,261,683	0	0
Lottery	\$11,581,069	\$26,290,194	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
Transfer in	\$2,988,820	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$5,541,366	\$915,660	\$1,316,481	0
TOTAL:	\$38,625,723	\$32,467,537	\$16,404,257	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$201,368	\$62,401	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$6,090,801	\$235,285	0	0
Contractual Services	\$1,043,101	\$650,307	0	0
Equipment	\$294,623	\$30,747	0	0
Fixed Charges	\$60,300	\$50,880	0	0
Travel	\$19,486	\$21,251	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$30,000,336	\$30,100,185	\$16,404,257	0
Employer Contributions	\$48	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$915,660	\$1,316,481	0	0
TOTAL:	\$38,625,723	\$32,467,537	\$16,404,257	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Principal Specialist

Program Director: Marsha Johnson

Telephone: 803-734-0923

Fax: 803-734-8297

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

This program was not funded through EIA in 2004–05. The objectives of the principal specialist program are as follows:

- To provide exemplary educators to serve as the principal in low performing schools upon the request of the superintendent
- Schools with a principal specialist for two consecutive years will show an improved absolute value.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 objectives for 2004–05 were met. There were 15 principal specialists placed. Reports of increases in the absolute value in schools with two consecutive years of service will be available in November 2005.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives for 2005–06 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 2005-06?

The number of principal specialists placed and a comparison of the absolute values over years will be used to assess effectiveness.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Professional development for principal specialists will include the changing definition of the calculation of the school's absolute value.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$2,278,799	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	\$2,270,302	\$2,426,085	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	\$1,846,742	\$1,532,573	0
TOTAL:	\$2,270,302	\$4,272,827	\$3,811,372	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$2,205	\$21,935	\$20,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$3,415	\$114,312	\$200,000	0
Contractual Services	\$32,063	\$316,785	\$400,000	0
Equipment	\$3,487	\$23,395	\$25,000	0
Fixed Charges	\$3,027	\$1,265	\$2,000	0
Travel	0	\$1,963	\$5,000	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$377,363	\$2,260,272	\$3,159,372	0
Employer Contributions	0	\$2,327	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$1,848,742	\$1,532,573	0	0
TOTAL:	\$2,270,302	\$4,274,827	\$3,811,372	\$ 0
# FTES:				

NOTE: Approximately \$991,000 of FY2006 Principal Specialist funding is projected for an expanded Principal Mentor Program.

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: External Review Team

Program Director: Gail Redford

Telephone: 803-734-3266

Fax: 803-734-0896

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of the External Review Team Program is to assign schools rated as unsatisfactory an external review team (ERT) to examine the school and district educational programs, actions, and activities, and make recommendations for improved student achievement.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 objectives for 2004–05 were met. Twenty-two schools received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2004 South Carolina Annual Report Card and were assigned an ERT.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for this program 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 2005-06?

Each school and district will receive a report with the ERT finding and recommendations. Recommendations will be presented to the State Board of Education for approval.

An external facilitator to determine strengths and areas requiring improvement to the overall external review process will conduct two External Review After-action sessions; the first session will include ERT members and the second session will include school administrators.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

The SDE will provide training for individuals serving on an ERT to address the requirements of the external review process for assessing the education program, actions, and activities of a school and district.

The SDE will provide training for school administrative teams and district personnel on the external review process, expectations, and final reporting.

The SDE will provide the State Board of Education with a final report of the findings and recommendations for each school receiving an external review.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$586,800	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	\$1,466,872	\$1,466,872	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$110,020	\$9,900	\$65,261	0
TOTAL:	\$5,576,892	\$1,476,772	\$652,061	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$23,351	\$35,245	\$40,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$988,708	\$35,476	\$40,000	0
Contractual Services	\$404,822	\$366,490	\$550,000	0
Equipment	\$142,676	\$4,245	\$5,500	0
Fixed Charges	\$5,790	\$3,090	\$4,000	0
Travel	\$979	\$1,724	5,400	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	\$960,624	0	0
Employer Contributions	\$1,210	\$6,617	\$7,161	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Transfer Out	\$3,997,252	0	0	0
Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$2,204	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$9,900	\$65,261	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,576,892	\$1,478,772	\$652,061	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Retraining Grants
Program Director: Genie Frontz
Telephone: 803-734-8320
Fax: 803-734-8701
E-mail: gfrontz@sde.state.sc.us

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective of the Retraining Grant Program is to provide funding to schools rated as unsatisfactory or below average for the implementation of retraining the school's faculty and administration as specified in the school's approved manual plan.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004–05 was met. 285 schools received funding during the year. A survey reflecting the implementation of the plan is currently being analyzed.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for this program remain the same for 2005–06.

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 2005–06?

Results from the survey, which reflect use of the funds according to the school's renewal plan, will be used to assess the program. Also included are fiscal audits routinely conducted.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Early notification to schools of the available funds, guidance on the planning process, and providing the funds in a timely fashion will help insure the program objectives for 2005–06 will be met.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$4,628,645	\$0	\$5,569,000	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	\$4,637,000	\$7,460,500	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$13,030	\$13,440	\$45,705	0
TOTAL:	\$9,278,675	\$7,473,940	\$5,614,705	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$5,565,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$221,795	\$17,342	0	0
Contractual Services	\$99,121	\$60,770	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	\$1,805	\$1,200	0	0
Travel	0	\$773	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$7,232,140	\$7,348,150	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Transfer Out	\$1,710,374	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$13,440	\$45,705	0	0
TOTAL:	\$9,278,675	\$7,473,940	\$5,565,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Report Cards

Program Director: David Burnett

Telephone: 803-734-8215

Fax: 803-734-2983

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

To publish the school and district report cards.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 school and district report cards were published, and school and district ratings were delivered to school district offices by November 1, 2004.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

To publish the school and district report cards.

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 2005-06?

The school and district report cards will be published, and school and district ratings will be delivered to school district offices by November 1, 2005.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Production schedules have been established and are monitored periodically.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$1,018,000	\$0	\$971,793	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	\$971,793	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	\$0	\$238,976	0
TOTAL:	\$1,018,000	\$971,793	\$1,210,769	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$21,858	\$9,003	\$85,750	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$14,797	\$22,651	\$2,000	0
Contractual Services	\$724,597	\$696,354	\$1,080,019	0
Equipment	\$38,054	0	\$38,000	0
Fixed Charges	\$134,385	0	0	0
Travel	\$11,342	\$3,497	\$5,000	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	\$1,312	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$46,207	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$26,760	\$238,976	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,018,000	\$971,793	\$1,210,769	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Palmetto Gold and Silver

Program Director: Ling Gao

Telephone: 803-734-4321

Fax: 803-734-8701

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective of this program is to publicly recognize schools with financial and material rewards for student achievement levels that are high or rapidly improving.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 was met for 2004–05. The criteria for selecting schools was applied to statewide data, qualifying schools were recognized through public release of school memos, and certificates, flags and memos were distributed.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective remains unchanged for 2005–06.

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 2005-06?

A timely and accurate announcement of recipient schools for 2005–06 is the criteria for successful implementation.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

To insure a successful implementation, the following will occur:

- Verification by the Office of Research as to the accuracy of the school ratings
- Inclusion of the announcement on the State Board of Education's agenda
- Public release of recipient schools

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	\$996,451	\$2,000,000	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$1,106	\$1,135	\$1,755	0
TOTAL:	\$1,997,557	\$2,001,135	\$3,001,755	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	\$1,289	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	\$1,996,271	\$1,998,091	\$3,00,175	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	\$151	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$1,135	\$1,755	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,997,557	\$2,001,135	\$3,001,755	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Alternative Technical Assistance

Program Director: Marsha Johnson

Telephone: 803-734-0923

Fax: 803-734-8297

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

This program was not funded with EIA funds during 2004–05. The objective of this program is to allow schools that qualify for on site technical assistance to apply for funding of alternative research based technical assistance. Funding resulting from approved applications is in lieu of on-site services.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 objectives for 2004–05 were met. Five applications were approved and funding for alternative research based technical assistance is operative.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for 2005–06 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 2005–06?

Notification of approved applications to schools in a timely fashion is the measure of effective implementation.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

To insure implementation the following actions will take place:

- Notification to superintendents/principals for eligible schools sent,
- Application posted on WEB page,
- Applications received, reviewed, and notice sent to district/school before April 25, 2006.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	*2003-04 Actual	*2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0
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
Transfer in program	0	\$2,445,000	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$2,445,000	\$4,000,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	*2003-04 Actual	*2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$54,320	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	\$125,906	0
Contractual Services	0	0	\$245,172	0
Equipment	0	0	\$4,850	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	\$26,190	0
Travel	0	0	\$6,790	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	\$2,445,000	\$3,536,772	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$2,445,000	\$4,000,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

* New program in 2005-06

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Technical Assistance

Program Director: Marsha Johnson

Telephone: 803-734-0923

Fax: 803-734-8297

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

This program is to improve the school's academic achievement by providing various technical assistance to low performing schools as determined by the external review team recommendations. This technical assistance may be through on-site personnel such as curriculum specialists and/or professional development opportunities for administrators and faculty. Schools with curriculum specialists for two consecutive years will show an improved absolute value.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 objectives of this program were met for 2004–05. There were 39 curriculum specialists placed in low performing schools. Professional development opportunities were attended by 323 participants in 7 sessions. Improvement in the absolute value is not currently available.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for this program remain the same for 2005–06.

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 2005-06?

The placement of curriculum specialists and the attendance at professional development opportunities will be used to assess the effectiveness of this program. Additionally, improvement in the schools' absolute values will be used.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

To assure meeting objectives for 2005–06, the following steps will be taken:

- Timely and efficient recruiting and placement of qualified personnel to serve as on-site personnel
- Timely, accurate, and efficient professional development opportunities offered on topics that are identified as essential

- Keeping informed and presenting to low performing schools changes in the report card calculations

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	*2003-04 Actual	*2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$10,810,000	\$0
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
Transfer in program	\$5,808,333	\$11,946,636	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,808,333	\$11,946,636	\$10,810,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	*2003-04 Actual	*2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$23,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	\$41,718	0
Contractual Services	0	0	\$139,698	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	\$16,686	0
Travel	0	0	\$10,542	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$5,808,333	\$11,946,636	\$9,636,008	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Transfer out	0	0	\$942,348	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$5,808,333	\$11,946,636	\$10,810,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

* New program in 2005-06

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Principal Leader

Program Director: Marsha Johnson

Telephone: 803-734-0293

Fax: 803-734-8297

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- Identify, select, place, train, and support a pool of exemplary educators with histories of student academic achievement to serve as Principal Leaders to improve student performance and to increase the rate of student progress in the assigned schools
- Reduce the number of schools rated as Unsatisfactory
- Schools with a principal leader for two consecutive years will show an improved absolute value.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 fiscal year 2004–05 objectives were met.

During the 2004–05 academic year, twelve Principal Leaders served twelve schools in eight districts.

Data on the success of those schools served by a principal leader for two years will be available November 2005.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Identify, select, place, train, and support a pool of exemplary educators with histories of student academic achievement to serve as Principal Leaders to improve student achievement
- Reduce the number of schools rated as Unsatisfactory
- Increase the school's absolute value over prior year values

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 2005-06?

- The number of Principal Leaders serving in schools
- The percentage of schools with higher absolute value

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- Potential candidates for the program will be recruited through newspaper ads, regional drop-ins, and mail-outs.
- Regular training sessions will be offered to Principal Leaders.
- The work of Principal Leaders will be monitored by monthly on-site visits. SDE staff will review schedules, logs, and other documentation and observe Principal Leaders at work.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$1,275,240	\$0
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
Program Transfer in	\$1,030,293	\$1,377,947	\$942,348	
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,030,293	\$1,377,947	\$2,217,588	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 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	\$1,030,293	\$1,377,947	\$2,217,588	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$1,030,293	\$1,377,947	\$2,217,588	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Summer School

Program Director: Harvey Chapman

Telephone: 803-734-8340

Fax: 803-734-6225

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective of this program is to provide funding for summer school and comprehensive remediation progress.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 the program was met. Funds were allocated to each public school district based on the number of academic subject area scores that are below basic on the prior year's spring PACT administration for students in grades three through eight.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objective remains the same for 2005–06.

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 2005-06?

The timely and efficient distribution of the funds to districts will be an indicator of successfully achieving the objective.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- Early notification to district of the allocation of funds
- District receipt of correct funding level
- Within specified timeline

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	*\$31,000,000	\$0
General Fund	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$31,000,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$30,750,000	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Other State Agencies	0	0	\$250,000	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$31,000,000	\$ 0

* Includes \$25,232,021 in non-recurring funds.

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Unique Student ID System

Program Director: Jake Jacobs

Telephone: 803-734-8395

Fax: 803-734-8661

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective in FY04-05 was to implement a system that would assign a unique ID to each student in South Carolina. This ID is to follow the student throughout his/her K-12 career.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

640,000 students have been assigned a unique ID. This information was made available for school districts to post into their SASI databases. We began a three-district pilot test of the School Interoperability Framework software component. The School Interoperability Framework (SIF) software provides real-time unique student ID number as the student information is being keyed into the SASI system in the school.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. **SUNS** - Assist the remaining 33 districts/entities to ensure that they properly install the School Interoperability Framework (SIF) software. Currently 55 districts have installed it.
- b. **Vertical Reporting** - Expand SIF implementation in at least twelve pilot districts to enable the real-time transfer of SASI data to the Department of Education. This will enable the building of a state SASI database that is updated daily and resides in the Department. This will facilitate accurate and timely data to the agency, EOC, legislature and federal government.
- c. **Horizontal Reporting** - Assist the twelve pilot districts in implementing the expanded SIF software to provide real-time updates to their library, school lunch, transportation, and HR systems.
- d. **Interoffice Data Exchange** - Explore the use of SIF software to transmit Teacher Certification data to the SDE Data Warehouse (SCEDS).

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 2005-06?

- a. **SUNS** - The initial SIF project will be successful when all 88 districts/entities have installed the SIF software.
- b. **Vertical Reporting** - When data is automatically transmitted to a database in the Department as it is being entered at the school level.

- c. **Horizontal Reporting** - When data is automatically transmitted to their library, school lunch, transportation, and HR systems.
- d. **Interoffice Data Exchange** - When the feasibility report is complete.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

We will continue to work with the vendor (Edustructures) and thirty-three districts to complete the statewide implementation of the SIF software. Negotiate the contract with Edustructures to work with NCS Pearson (SASI vendor) for the expansion of the SIF software to allow vertical and horizontal reporting of SASI data elements. Conduct a feasibility study to determine the requirements to SIF-enable Teacher Certification database.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$891,370	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	\$488,000	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	\$33,080	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$488,000	\$924,450	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	\$50,000	0
Contractual Services	0	\$454,920	\$774,450	0
Equipment	0	0	\$100,000	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$33,080	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$488,000	\$924,450	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Data Collection – SASI

Program Director: Jake Jacobs

Telephone: 803-734-8395

Fax: 803-734-8661

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The objective of this program is to provide annual maintenance fees for a flexible Windows-based data collection and reporting system (SASIXp) to all public school districts and public schools to facilitate education accountability to provide a responsive data collection, storage, retrieval, and reporting system.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

Information was collected on approximately 670,000 students every 45 days throughout FY04-05. This data has been loaded into the Data Warehouse (SCEDS) and is being used to respond to requests for information from the SDE, legislature, EOC and the federal government.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The objectives for FY05-06 are to work with schools/districts to obtain complete and accurate information from SASIXp. We need teacher certification number, teaching schedule and student unique ID number to determine if teachers are highly qualified and to determine the impact on 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 2005-06?

We plan to edit the data that we receive on 670,000 students from SASIXp and post the results on the web, so that schools can correct invalid or missing data. This will be done for each 45 day collection.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Meetings will be held with District Technology Directors and Program Managers at SDE to explain how the data from SASIXp is used and why it is critical that it is correct. Communications will be sent via e-mails, a data collection manual has been posted on the web explaining data elements needed and for what purpose. We will record the number of invalid or missing fields and track the progress throughout the school year.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$1,049,375	\$0
General Fund	0	0	0	0
Lottery	0	\$2,048,925	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	\$767,262	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$2,048,925	\$1,816,637	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	\$4,085	0	0
Contractual Services	0	\$1,194,290	\$1,816,637	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	\$83,288	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$767,262	0	0
TOTAL:	\$ 0	\$2,048,925	\$1,816,637	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 with a corresponding increase in scores meeting standard.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004-05 objectives were met in part.

Effectiveness Measures: Student performance on the PACT, grades three through eighth, as measured by decreases in the percent not meeting standard or scoring below basic and increases in the percent meeting standard or scoring at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels.

Summary of Spring 2005 PACT results:

In nearly all grades tested in 2005, results were up for students meeting standard.

Grade 3

English/Language Arts – 2005: 87.1%; 2004: 85.8%; 2003: 81.8%

Mathematics – 2005: 83.4%; 2004: 82.7%; 2003: 82.3%

Science – 2005: 64.4%; 2004: 60%; 2003: 56.2%

Social Studies – 2005: 79.4%; 2004: 72.1%; 2003: 61%

Grade 4

English/Language Arts – 2005: 79.6%; 2004: 80.7%; 2003: 76.4%

Mathematics – 2005: 78.6%; 2004: 80.3%; 2003: 81.1%

Science – 2005: 61.8%; 2004: 62.3%; 2003: 57.1%

Social Studies – 2005: 77.2%; 2004: 71%; 2003: 64.7%

Grade 5

English/Language Arts – 2005: 76.8%; 2004: 76.6%; 2003: 68.2%

Mathematics – 2005: 77.2%; 2004: 76.2%; 2003: 74.6%

Science – 2005: 56.7%; 2004: 60.3%; 2003: 58.2%

Social Studies – 2005: 63.9%; 2004: 63.5%; 2003: 60.4%

Grade 6

English/Language Arts – 2005: 63.5%; 2004: 64%; 2003: 65.7%

Mathematics – 2005: 78.7%; 2004: 77.2%; 2003: 75.5%

Science – 2005: 56.2%; 2004: 54.2%; 2003: 58.4%

Social Studies – 2005: 64.9%; 2004: 64.7%; 2003: 59.6%

Grade 7

English/Language Arts – 2005: 71.5%; 2004: 71.9%; 2003: 70.2%

Mathematics – 2005: 71.5%; 2004: 71.5%; 2003: 68.8%

Science – 2005: 61.7% 2004: 62.7%; 2003: 58.8%

Social Studies – 2005: 58.7%; 2004: 60%; 2003: 58.8%

Grade 8

English/Language Arts – 2005: 74.7%; 2004: 73.3%; 2003: 66.8%

Mathematics – 2005: 66.3%; 2004: 67.5%; 2003: 67.1%

Science – 2005: 60%; 2004: 58.9%; 2003: 56.8%

Social Studies – 2005: 66.5%; 2004: 64.7%; 2003: 60.8%

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 2005-06.

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 2005–06?

PACT scores

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

Districts must provide appropriate services and expend funds in accordance with the Funding Manual given the FY 2006 flexibility initiative for districts.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,436,576	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,436,576	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$114,250,421	\$120,185,953	\$120,436,576	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Aid to State Agencies	\$179,096	\$166,853		
Budget Reduction	5,982,880	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$120,412,397	\$120,352,806	\$120,436,576	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Reading Recovery
1A.11.(SDE-EIA: XI.A-Academic Assistance/Reading Recovery)

Program Director: Pamela Huxford

Telephone: 803-734-8825

Fax: 803-734-6142

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(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 12 to 20 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 2004–05 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 2003–04 (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. 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. The data reported that 31 school districts now participate in Reading Recovery and that 203 schools have Reading Recovery in their building. During this reporting period, 3,364 students were served in Reading Recovery statewide and 78% of those students that received a full program (2,077) could read at the average level of their classmates (discontinuation rate). In addition, (29) new Reading Recovery teachers were trained statewide in the Reading Recovery model as well as (6) Reading Recovery teacher leaders. Children who are successful in the program are unlikely to be retained or 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 2005-06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The program objectives for the 2005–06 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 2005-06?

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 2005-06, 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 2 lessons each session
- teach a child behind the glass for colleagues as scheduled
- receive at least one school visit from a teacher leader annually

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$0
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	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,370,904	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Aid to State Agencies (Clemson University RR Training Site)	\$163,147	\$163,147	\$163,147	0
Budget Reduction	\$7,757	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,370,904	\$3,363,147	\$3,363,147	\$ 0
# FTES:	0.5	0.5	0.5	

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Reduce Class Size Grades 1–3

Program Director: Harvey Chapman

Telephone: 803-734-8340

Fax: 803-734-6225

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- To provide the local school districts the opportunity to reduce the class size for grades one through three to 15-to-1 pupil-teacher ratio
- To determine district allocation of funds based on the rate of students qualifying for the free and reduced lunch program
- To distribute allocated funds to the districts on a monthly basis

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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.)*

Funds were distributed to eighty-five school districts to reduce the class size.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives are the same as for 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 2005-06?

Data from the Office of Finance will be used to assess the objectives.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

The Office of School Quality will assess reduced class size as a component of the accreditation of schools.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$0	\$35,047,429	\$0
General Fund	\$35,491,067	\$35,047,429	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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$35,491,067	\$35,047,429	\$35,047,429	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$35,491,067	\$35,047,429	\$35,047,429	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$35,491,067	\$35,047,429	\$35,047,429	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Half Day 4K (PreKindergarten) Program

Program Director: Linda C. Mims

Telephone: 803-734-9052

Fax: 803-734-8343

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The mission of this program is to provide high quality ½ day programs for four year olds in South Carolina through a developmentally appropriate curriculum recommended by the Department of Education, following all portions of Regulation 261.4 and assessed for program quality with the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale.

- a. Results of the National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER) and the SERVE study will give needed impetus to the development of 4K programs in the state and the use of Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) will further 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.
- b. The use of South Carolina Readiness Assessment (SCRA) will be improved by (a) increasing the number of training initiatives by 10%, (b) increasing the reliability of data gained by assuring that similar understanding of progress is occurring among practitioners, and will be determined by teacher/administrator interviews (increase of confidence of 5%), and (3) improving the print materials and computer-based support for SCRA and SCRAPI (by 5% more incidences of helpful information for teachers).
- c. 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.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004-2005, - one distance education course was offered to 70 students in 6 public school districts and 1 Head Start center, 68 teachers received four weeks of High/Scope Lead Teacher Training, 30 coordinators and consultants received 3 weeks of Teacher Trainer Preparation in High/Scope, 227 teachers attended a High/Scope conference, 498 teachers and administrators attended two instate Montessori conferences, 28 teachers enrolled in 250 hours of Montessori training (most of that is still going on); 68 teachers attended a five day Creative Curriculum training, an average of 67 early childhood coordinators attended 3 two-day meetings for training in South Carolina Readiness Assessment, ECERS, and updates on early childhood initiatives; all of this training has a direct impact on the quality of classroom environment and instruction. Results of the NIEER national study of South Carolina 4K programs is not complete; the timeline extended the projected month of completion by five months. Results are expected this fall; the preliminary data indicates that children in EIA funded 4K programs outperform their peers on normed assessments given upon entry into the kindergarten school year.

A study by SERVE is partially complete concerning the implementation and use of ECERS in prek classrooms:

ECERS Data:

2004	2005
22 primary schools were observed	27 schools primary observed; 53 other schools were also observed
80 classrooms	98 classrooms; 153 classrooms total
Mean enrollment of children was 501 per school	Mean enrollment of children was 501 per school
Mean free and reduced lunch count for observed schools was 61.4%	42.8%
1/3 of principals have early childhood certification	¼ of principals have early childhood certification
Average score of 4K classrooms was 4.92	Average score of ECERS classrooms was 5.63
Half of teachers had BA degree and half had Masters or above	Half of teachers had BA degree and half had Masters or above
70% had nitial certification in early childhood education	60% had initial certification in early childhood education

- Scores on all individual subscales of ECERS were also significantly higher in Spring, 2005
 - In teacher-administered surveys, 92% stated their knowledge of appropriate classrooms improved, 61% stated that their attitudes towards the use of ECERS improved, and 58% stated that they believe that ECERS is necessary for program improvement. 91% of administrators believe that ECERS is necessary for program improvement.
 - 78% of teachers made substantive changes to their classrooms based on ECERS
 - 55% of the teachers reported that they know the quality of their classroom improved after use of ECERS
 - 50% of the teachers reported that their parents were notified about ECERS work in the classrooms
 - 14% of the parents made deliberate contacts to the schools in support of ECERS
 - In the annual program study of state 4K (prek) programs, National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER) rated South Carolina as having met 8 out of 10 national criteria for high quality programs; in 2003-2004, the state met 7 criteria.
- b. Training in use of the South Carolina Readiness Assessment improved by over 10%. There were 7 local days of training in various parts of the state, 649 questions answered by phone or email relative to SCRA, three state training events were held, 4 hours of distance education coursework delivered, 3 letters sent to practitioners describing strategies for improved use. Random surveys of coordinators and teachers indicate that the improved training is useful but much more is needed. This objective will be continued for 2005-2006. Materials and computer based support for SCRA and SCRAPI have improved by more than 5%; emails and phone calls answering questions, tutoring on-line by SCRA consultant, SCRA Guidelines and other supporting information were disseminated and placed on SDE website, and question and answer page on the website was reviewed and updated.
- c. ECERS data can be seen in item #2 above.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- a. According to Proviso 1.A.66, districts shall begin submitting annual early childhood assets studies
- b. The number of slots available for prekindergarten children will increase by 10%.
- c. Children who were served in the prek classrooms in 2002-2003 will perform as well as or better than their peers on 3rd grade PACT in 2006-2007.
- d. The quality of classrooms observed with ECERS will improve by 1/3 of a full point from the average in 2005. (authors of the tool recommend this as a successful state improvement)
- e. The number of NAEYC accredited classrooms will increase by 10%.

- f. Every prek teachers in the state will receive at least one contact by a staff member of the Office of Early Childhood Education.

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 2005-06?

- a. The Office of Early Childhood Education will provide training to districts on the requirements of an early childhood assets review and will collect all data pertinent to the review.
- b. The Office of Early Childhood Education will monitor the enrollment of prek programs throughout the year; regional and state meetings as well as email contacts and formal letters will be used to encourage sites to use all available funds for prekindergarten slots.
- c. The staff of the Office of Research and the Office of Early Childhood Education will analyze SASI data as well as other early childhood data to determine if children who were served in the program four years ago are performing as well as or better than their peers. (completion of the NIEER study will add value to this measure)
- d. Annual reviews of classrooms with ECERS (upon invitation; monitoring visits for accountability purposes ended with Proviso 1.81.)
- e. NAEYC accreditation progress in districts will be reported to OECE.
- f. OECE staff will maintain records of contacts to teachers and other 4K (prek) staff.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, will be met?

- a. Districts will be offered state and regional training in the preparation of the early childhood assets studies.
- b. Districts will submit required early childhood assets studies according to SDE timeline.
- c. OECE will regularly review SASI reports.
- d. OECE Office Director will maintain records of district contacts as well as all local, district, regional, or state training that is provided to local sites.
- e. OECE will disseminate the results of the final SERVE (quality of the implementation of ECERS) and NIEER (quality of the prek classrooms and programs) studies to the state.
- f. OECE will review and collect data from SASI that will strengthen annual reports concerning the quality of the prek programs as monitored by ECERS and the performance of children as provided through DIAL entrance scores and Work Sampling assessments in specific classrooms.
- g. OECE staff will acknowledge all school districts and/or classrooms that receive NAEYC accreditation.
- h. OECE staff will submit monthly reports listing monthly activities including contacts to prek teachers and administrators.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,678	\$21,832,678	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,678	\$21,832,678	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$22,514,278	\$21,832,678	\$21,532,678	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain - Proviso	0	0	\$300,000	0
*Budget Reduction	\$356,505	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$22,870,783	\$21,832,678	\$21,832,678	\$ 0
# FTES:				* 1

* Budget reductions may not reconcile with submitted reduction to Office of State Budget due to allowing districts to choose EIA programs

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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 2004-2005 objectives were met. The program provided transportation to 8,874 students.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, will be met?

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

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$450,776	\$450,776	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$472,210	\$450,776	\$450,776	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Family Literacy and Parent Support

Program Director: Harriette Jenerette

Telephone: 803-734-4708

Fax: 803-734-8343

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

- a. **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 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. Proviso 1A. 26 requires that all families and children served through state funded family literacy programs receive high quality, intensive, integrated services of parenting education, GED or adult education, childcare or prekindergarten and early literacy activities.
- b. **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 2004–05 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.)*

Objectives of Fiscal Year 2004-2005 were met. Documented impact of these programs was reported by school districts as listed below:

- Increased parent involvement in the learning process of preschool children ages birth through five years

	2004	2005
Parents attended group parenting meetings	5939 parents	4513
Children, ages 3 and below in homes where families are receiving parenting assistance	7529	4277

in the home		
Children served in childcare while families were being served in parenting classes	4587	2527

(Data indicates that greater numbers of parents were involved in all four components of family literacy but there were smaller numbers in the isolated categories.)

- Increased level of school readiness of children as assessed by the South Carolina Readiness Assessment, (SCRA)

	2004	2005
Average Score for English Language Arts (children consistently demonstrating competency)	72.3	77
Average Score for Mathematics (children consistently demonstrating competency)	71.3	75.3
Personal and Social Development (children consistently demonstrating competency)	72.6	76.4

- To offer parents special opportunities to improve their literacy skills and education

	2004	2005
Parents who attended adult literacy or adult education classes	2,216	2,090
Parents who graduated with a GED or diploma	714	665

- To identify potential developmental delays in preschool children by offering developmental screening.

	2004	2005
Number of children who received developmental screening as a part of the district family literacy programs	6,859	6519

District data indicates that there are 4250 families 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, all districts submitted the report on line. There were quite a few gaps in the reports and the OECE staff had to make phone calls for clarifying information.

Training Provided for District Staff by the Office of Early Childhood Education

Name of Purpose of Training	Place	Number of district family literacy staff participants	Percentage of attendees who stated they had learned something they could implement in their district programs
Keys to Quality: Leadership Workshop	Watkins Adult Learning Center, Richland 1 School District	34	100%
Family Literacy Lottery Strategy (2 nights of presentations)	Delivered over distance education – site meeting held at USC Child Development and Research Center	Undetermined	NA
Literacy in Early Childhood	Richland One	20	100%
Performance Indicators	Columbia	130	
EOC regarding district progress in the implementation of ACT 135 proviso	February 14, RM 214 Blatt Building	4 board members and 5 others were present	NA
Family Literacy Training Academy	Greenville	44	100%
Family Literacy Training Academy	Florence	60	100%
Family Literacy Training Academy	Lancaster	22	100%
Even Start Coordinators' Meeting and Training	Columbia	54	100%
Act 135 Family Literacy Regional Workshop	Columbia	57	100%
Act 135 Family Literacy Regional Workshop	Colleton	45	100%
<i>Parents as Partners</i>	<i>Orangeburg</i>	15	80%
<i>Updates on Family Literacy</i> (all family literacy coordinators were invited) Training on Peabody Picture Vocabulary	<i>Watkins</i>	58	90%

Other effective strategies:

- Distributed **Language Is Key** videos, "Talking and Books" and "Talking and Play" both in English and Spanish and a training guide to all schools districts to use in their parenting/ childcare components of family literacy – over 30% of family literacy programs indicate that a large population that they try to serve speak Spanish
- Prepared an update to the EOC regarding technical assistance provided to districts and their progress in the implementation of the ACT135 proviso. All districts have submitted implementation plans and are well underway in developing comprehensive family literacy programs.

- Analyzed 2004 ACT135 P/FL end of year reports, created a spreadsheet consolidating reports and identifying districts that lacked information on one or more of the three report pages; communicated with technical services regarding data so that districts could enter missing data
- Met with First Steps Family Literacy content team to discuss goals of OECE and FS relative to family literacy needs assessment and training plans
- Began meetings with the Urban League and Junior League concerning family literacy needs – additional funding through their venues would be helpful (especially good since a portion of state funds were allocated to Urban League for 2004-2005)
- Family Literacy Content Team (composed of First Steps and OECE staff) met to discuss strategies and training 9 times; Family Literacy Consortium met 4 times during the year with an average attendance of 12 other than OECE staff.

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 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

FY05 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.
- To strengthen family literacy programs by integrating parent education, interactive literacy, adult education and early childhood to provide a comprehensive family literacy program.

The last objective is new; not only should quality family literacy programs offer the above components but due to the state's new family literacy proviso, all components must be integrated (the same families should receive all components). (This is a hard concept for many district personnel to grasp. The turnover rate for family literacy staff is high also. Too many people still think of offering the isolated program components, rather than offering the integrated model. Continued monitoring and professional development and local administrative support are the keys to improvement.)

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 2005–06?

- Efforts will be made to track the quality of parent activities which target the learning process of children, ages birth through five years (annual reports of districts verifying their progress on quality indicators)
- Through SASI, a random sampling of children whose parents participate in district family literacy programs will be evaluated by their SCRA records
- Through the Family Literacy Online Information System (FLOIS), GED classes and other educational classes will be monitored to see progress of the adult learners (parents)
- Through FLOIS and online “end of the year” program reports, determine how many districts actually involve the same families in all four family literacy program components; begin analyzing academic and developmental progress of parents and children (health records, attendance at school functions, participation in teacher conferences, FLOIS information pertinent to parenting and adult education).

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- a. Special training activities will be provided to district parenting/family literacy coordinators and their community partners
 - to improve program quality and
 - to recruit and retain parents
 - to facilitate the on-line data collections system
- b. Districts will be expected to report on the South Carolina Family Literacy Performance Indicators for Quality Assurance and Evaluation.
- c. Districts will be required to implement a comprehensive family literacy program based on the Keenan Model and provide evidence of the comprehensiveness of the program through the completion of a Family Literacy Implementation Continuation Plan

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$5,859,601	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$5,859,601	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$5,505,366	\$5,530,526	\$5,434,601	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Proviso	\$310,249	\$325,000	\$425,000	0
Budget Reduction	\$278,420	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$39,911	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$6,133,946	\$5,855,526	\$5,859,601	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 as are most District Teachers of the Year. 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. All awards are subject to state taxes.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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. Eighty-four districts, (out of eighty-five), plus the Department of Juvenile Justice participated in the 2004–05 Teacher of the Year program. The State Teacher of the Year, Linda "Cookie" Winburn served as an exceptional role model and ambassador for the state. A banquet was held on May 7, 2005, 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 2005–06? 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 rewards. 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 teaching-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 2005–06?

The Educator Quality and Leadership strategic goals are directly tied to the Teacher of the Year program. These goals include teacher 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 program, 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 standards for the state. Effectiveness of the program may be judged on the quality of the teachers selected to hold these prestigious positions and the high level of participation. These teachers 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 2005–06, will be met?

The Division of Educator Quality and Leadership 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 Educator Quality and Leadership 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 2005–06 State Teacher of the Year with the creation of a platform. The Division of Educator Quality and Leadership 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$155,016	\$156,390	\$166,102	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$7,898	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$11,086	\$9,712	0	0
TOTAL:	\$174,000	\$166,102	\$166,102	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

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

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 process for streamlining conducting FBI background checks on teacher candidates is progressing. We now have the capability to accept electronic reports from the FBI. This has reduced our turnaround time from the FBI from ten to twelve weeks to one week. The current process still requires us to scan the report into the database. We will work this year to develop a program that will allow the electronic report to go directly into the database matched to the appropriate teacher's file. We will also continue to work on obtaining the fingerprints electronically and eventually eliminating the paper and ink method.
- The procedures for conducting background checks on teacher candidates prior to student teaching have been developed and implemented.
- The ADEPT regulation, 43-205.1, was approved by the State Board and the General Assembly and went into effect June 24, 2005. The guidelines are currently being developed and will be presented to the State Board for approval in spring 2006.
- A fact sheet on each teacher education program has been developed and will be presented to the State Board of Education in January 2006. The fact sheet summarizes information about each teacher education program, including the results of Praxis II exam scores for program completers.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Increase field experiences for teacher candidates in high need districts.
- Expand the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) to other schools in South Carolina.

- Begin the process of converting add-on certification from a course-by-course approach to the completion of an approved program (goes into effect July 1, 2009).
- Implement policy changes required by Title II, Part A of No Child Left Behind (e.g., discontinue issuing out of field permits in core content areas).
- Begin requiring the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam as a prerequisite for initial certification.
- Expand the availability of courses through collaborative arrangements with teacher education programs and distance education for teachers who are seeking middle level certification.
- Use Web casting, distance education, and Web based methods to reach teachers in all parts of South Carolina and provide courses and high quality professional development.
- Conduct a thorough evaluation of the current PACE admission, training, and certification criteria to determine if the program is serving the school districts, participants and students of South Carolina.
- Provide training and other support to teachers who serve as mentors to beginning teachers.

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 2005-06?

- Annual reports (submitted on July 1) from teacher education programs will show increased field experiences in high need districts.
- The number of TAP schools will increase in 2006-07 by ten percent.
- A meeting will be held with teacher education program representatives in spring 2006 to outline the process that units need to take to prepare for the policy change. Teachers will be notified via email and the Web site.
- Out of field permits in core content areas will not be issued for the 2006-07 school year.
- The certification analysts will look for evidence that the teacher candidate has submitted a passing score on the Principles of Learning and Teaching prior to issuing an initial teaching certificate.
- An initiative will be developed modeled after Project CREATE to offer courses through distance education and onsite for teachers seeking to become certified in middle level subjects.
- Determine the number of courses and professional development offered via distance education, Web casts, and Web based.
- An evaluation report will be produced.
- A database of teachers who are trained as mentors will be maintained.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005-06, will be met?

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

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821	\$ 0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$109,740	\$96,120	\$20,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$21,022	\$45,745	\$50,000	0
Contractual Services	\$85,407	\$64,410	\$170,000	0
Equipment	\$50,679	\$36,933	\$41,000	0
Fixed Charges	\$235,824	\$242,528	\$250,000	0
Travel	\$9,874	\$11,599	\$12,821	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$25,858	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$31,275	\$46,486	0	0
TOTAL:	\$569,679	\$543,821	\$543,821	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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:

- 2.1 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 2005 Program Objective: Achieve a SC average teacher salary as directed and funded by the General Assembly.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004-05 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 2005 SC average teacher salary goal was \$41,691. Average teacher salary attained was \$42,189.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 2006 goal is \$42,737. Revised projection is \$42,959.

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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, will be met?

Districts will be required to pay the FY 2006 South Carolina State Minimum Salary Schedule.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$242,444,103	\$261,507,246	\$122,179,194	\$0
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
Transfer in	0	\$1,827,546	\$1,692,580	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	\$12,181,345	0	0
TOTAL:	\$242,444,103	\$275,516,137	\$123,871,774	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$230,262,758	\$275,393,408	\$123,871,774	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$12,181,345	\$122,729	0	0
TOTAL:	\$242,444,103	\$275,516,137	\$123,871,774	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: Critical Teaching Needs

Program Director: Beth Cope

Telephone: 803-734-8116

Fax: 803-734-8324

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(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 Title II and/or the district strategic plan or school improvement plan, (2) middle schools project course, (3) preparation for technologies program, (4) curriculum standards training, and (5) education of students with disabilities or special needs in the regular classroom.

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 2004–05 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 2004–05, eighty-five school districts received funds ranging from \$2,381 to \$15,354, for a total of \$602,911. Three consortia were formed, and these provided services to approximately 24 districts. Other districts provided courses through their respective districts. The total unduplicated count of CTN courses offered was 100, and the total number of teachers participating was approximately 1,676. The percentage of courses in approved subjects areas during the 2004–05 were as follows: 24 percent—technology; 17 percent—science; 10 percent—reading; 3 percent—mathematics; and 46 percent—special needs and other approved courses aligned with specific needs of the districts. (Roper Mountain Science Center in Greenville County received \$250,000 of the \$602,911 and offered 16 (of the 17) science courses to 261 (included in the 1,676) 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 2005–06? 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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, will be met?

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

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2004-05 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$591,564	\$602,911	\$602,911	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$11,347	0	0	0
Carry Forward to Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$602,911	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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 total of 637 teachers attained National Board Certification during 2003-04. This number is lower than the previous years and will make it more challenging to reach the goal of 5,000 in 2005.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The state has one remaining year (announcements will be made in November 2005) to reach its goal of having 5,000 National Board Certified teachers. In order to accomplish that goal, 1101 teachers must achieve National Board Certification during 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 2005-06?

The announcement of the teachers who receive National Board Certification in Winter 2005.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
EIA	\$0	\$27,968,264	\$39,280,874	\$0
General Fund	\$36,803,080	\$11,276,610	\$2,617,126	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)	\$5,150	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$36,808,230	\$39,244,874	\$41,898,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003–04 Actual	2004–05 Actual	2005–06 Estimated	2006–07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0
Contractual Services	\$67,216	\$22,406	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	\$27,768,267	\$32,726,570	\$39,043,100	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
NBPT – Application Fees	\$2,869,000	\$2,026,200	\$2,704,900	0
CERRA	100,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	0
GSAH, John De La Howe	\$53,392	\$53,370	0	0
IDTs DJJ, SCADB	\$8,899	\$71,160	0	0
Fee Reimbursement to teachers who banked scores	\$29,000	\$1,000	0	0
Transfer out EFA-Proviso	\$5,912,456	\$4,244,168	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$31,123	0	0
TOTAL:	\$36,808,230	\$39,244,874	\$41,898,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2005 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 2004–05 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 2004-05 program objectives were met in accordance with the Proviso outlined below.

1A.34. (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 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

Objectives have not changed for FY 2005-06.

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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, will be met?

SDE and districts must comply with the proviso.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$12,500,000	\$0
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	\$239,639	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,239,639	\$10,000,000	\$12,500,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$9,756,573	\$9,903,083	\$12,500,000	0
Allocations to Governor's Schools	\$1,800	\$1,464	0	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$481,266	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	\$95,453	0	0
TOTAL:	\$10,239,639	\$10,000,000	\$12,500,000	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? (*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. \$5.55 million was allocated directly to districts in support of this mission through the Professional Development for Standards Implementation Program (PDSI). The 2004–05 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 2004–05 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 Web-based report summarizing the progress made toward these goals. The Office of Curriculum and Standards monitored the PDSI program, conducting desk audits of the summary reports. The findings of these reports that were due on September 1, 2005, will be placed on the Department's PDSI Website by October 30. Based on the most recent data provide by the districts (as of September 20, 2005), these funds supported the professional development of over 37,000 teachers. The chart shows the breakdown of grade-level and content emphasis.

Content Area	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Total	Percent
English language arts	4851	1548	1272	7671	20.6%
Foreign languages	109	73	152	334	0.9%
Health	238	81	106	425	1.1%
Mathematics	3982	1427	1056	6465	17.3%
Physical education	318	154	133	605	1.6%
Science	2907	925	989	4821	12.9%
Social studies	2911	913	697	4521	12.1%
Visual and performing arts	315	144	149	608	1.6%
Multi-curricular/Other	6016	3266	2544	11,826	31.8%
(62 districts reporting) Total	21,647	8,531	7,098	37,276	
	58.1%	22.9%	19.0%		

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 a series of Taxonomy Academies, a method for aligning the state's academic standards with the revised Bloom's taxonomy. Beginning in 2004, all academic standards will be based on this revised taxonomy. During 2004–05, 250 educators, representing approximately two-thirds of the districts, participated in the six-day academy conducted by Dr. Lorin W. Anderson. (http://www.myschools.com/offices/cso/enhance/Taxonomy_Academy_04.htm)

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

The 2005–06 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 2005-06?

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 2005–06, 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$6,646,260	\$6,204,060	\$4,413,485	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$1,996,685	\$1,790,575	\$888,712	0
TOTAL:	\$8,642,945	\$7,994,635	\$5,302,197	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$29,083	\$28,770	\$20,385	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$146,565	\$187,000	\$15,000	0
Contractual Services	\$1,420,980	\$493,750	\$135,000	0
Equipment	\$4,799	\$3,000	\$3,500	0
Fixed Charges	\$40,300	\$28,247	\$4,000	0
Travel	\$26,004	\$34,186	\$5,000	0
Allocations to Districts/Entities	\$4,872,937	\$6,330,970	\$5,119,312	0
Employer Contributions	\$5,029	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$306,674	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$1,790,574	\$888,712	0	0
TOTAL:	\$8,642,945	\$7,994,635	\$5,302,197	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

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

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 2004–05? *(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 the Department's Mathematics and Science Unit's (MSU) eight 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 2004–05 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 2004–05 school year, the mathematics and science centers provided high quality professional development to teachers in one hundred and fifty schools in sixty school districts in the following areas: elementary and middle school mathematics, and science; middle school and high school mathematics and science. The specific areas for the training included science and mathematics kit training, elementary and middle school mathematics curriculum support training, and training to support high school teachers whose courses include an End of Course Examination (Algebra and Physical Science).
- b. To the thirty coaches prepared during the 2003–04 school year were added thirty additional coaches in a similar number of schools. The mathematics and science coaches provided the equivalent of eight additional professional development days (60 hours) to each of the 1,500 teachers in the schools with coaches.
- c. Exemplary kit training was provided to fifty schools in twenty-eight school districts. In addition, kit training is an integral part of the professional development in the schools with science coaches. One

thousand two hundred teachers received training and follow up support in the Creating Excellence in Elementary and Middle School Mathematics (CEEMM).

- d. Nine hundred and eighty-five teachers received professional development from the South Carolina Algebra Classroom, the Physical Science Companion, and Inquiry Workshop training.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 resulting in increased student achievement. In addition, districts will be able to receive training to enable individual districts to use the Mathematics and Science Coaching Model to support its own professional development.
- c. The Mathematics and Science Center specialists will support the use of exemplary science and mathematics materials in elementary and middle schools and will provide support for mathematics instruction through Creating Excellence in Elementary and Middle School Mathematics. In addition, the MSU will fully develop a Professional Development Institute in mathematics and in science that can be used to support schools without coaches.

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 2005–06?

- 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 2005–06, will be met?

Professional development activities provided by the MSU 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	\$2,829,017	\$2,675,794	\$2,900,382	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$137,908	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$71,365	\$224,588	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,038,290	\$2,900,382	\$2,900,382	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: School Leadership Executive Institute (SLEI)

Program Director: Mark Bounds

Telephone: 803-734-8558

Fax: 803-734-5486

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

Effectiveness Measures:

1. What were the objectives of this program during Fiscal Year 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

The 2004-05 objective of the SLEI program was to deliver rigorous, ongoing leadership training for principals and superintendents that provided participants the skills and competencies required to lead their schools and districts successfully while improving student and school performance. This is accomplished by immersing participants in a two-year intensive program in partnership with the Center for Creative Leadership. Below are some participant objectives.

Participants will:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gain a deep understanding of their strengths and improvement areas through ... 	the use of numerous 360 degree assessment instruments and professional feedback
<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 employees" and designing an action plan to address those individuals
<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 2005-2006 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 and <u>facilitating group meetings as part of SLEI</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they are effective facilitators by... 	assessing feedback from their constituencies and <u>facilitating group sessions as part of SLEI</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they understand the process of strategic planning by... 	reviewing their School Renewal Plan (SRP), aligning it to the District Strategic Plan and SC state standards including alignment of the school's professional development plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate that they can manage conflict by... 	practicing and modeling methods of defining and defusing potential conflict situations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate that they can design effective staff development by... 	using national and South Carolina Professional Development Standards to create a professional development strategy for their school / district
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of building capacity by... 	creating a process to extend and enrich teachers' competence and confidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of the writing process by... 	successfully completing all written assignments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of the basics of technology by... 	using appropriate technology to complete SLEI assignments and by using an instrument to assess the use of technology in their school / district and creating a technology plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their knowledge of personnel procedures by... 	using case studies to build and refine an effective supervision process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of data-driven decision making by... 	disaggregating their own test data and developing goals and objectives based on that data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of lesson design by... 	monitoring and evaluating lesson plans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of curriculum alignment by... 	working with teachers to develop curriculum and lesson plans that are nested in the SC standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their ability to build broad based partnerships by... 	developing / improving their school marketing plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of the observation/evaluation process by... 	developing an action plan that includes steps needed to assess teachers' classroom performance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate their understanding of the conferencing process by... 	successfully practicing conferencing skills with cohort participants

2. Were the Fiscal Year 2004–05 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 74 participants in the first year of the program met the objectives set for Year One (as listed above). Participants completed all assignments acceptably, met attendance requirements, and submitted acceptable action plans in order to complete their year.
- 100% of the 69 participants in the second year of the program met the objectives set for Year Two (as listed above). Participants 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%.
- To date 326 principals have graduated from SLEI. The program currently initiates three new cohorts each year serving approximately 80 principals. Research indicates approximately 40% of all South Carolina administrators will be able to retire within the next five years. This further validates the tremendous need for the SLEI program. SLEI must continue to serve 80-100 principals per year to keep pace with current attrition projections.
- The program has continued to be intensive, long-term, and 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 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- Objectives for 2005-2006 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 2005-06?

- The demand for this program as measured by SLEI participation rates as well as communication with principals and superintendents.
- Participant satisfaction with instruction and program delivery as measured by end of session surveys.
- Participant feedback on the impact of SLEI on their success as school and district leaders as measured by follow-up participant surveys.
- A review to determine the number of SLEI graduates that assume roles of increased responsibility and accountability in public education.
- Analysis of gains achieved in schools and districts that are lead by an SLEI graduate
- Compare school data for schools lead by SLEI graduates and non-graduates.

5. What measurable actions will be taken to assure that the program objectives of the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06, will be met?

- We will receive continuous feedback from participants on the quality and value of SLEI. The feedback will be in the form of open electronic communication, session surveys, and After Action Reviews (AAR). Program modifications will be made based on that feedback.
- Data is reviewed as available and modifications / enhancements are made.
- The Director of the Office of School Leadership closely monitors program delivery.
- The Deputy Superintendent for Educator Quality and Leadership (DEQL) requires routine updates to ensure program objectives are on track.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$949,466	\$906,370	\$906,370	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	\$124,856	\$24,310	\$80,961	0
TOTAL:	\$1,074,322	\$930,680	\$987,331	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$3,000	\$2,700	\$4,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$40,025	\$114,400	\$129,000	0
Contractual Services	\$942,845	\$712,215	\$799,000	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Fixed Charges	\$16,722	\$15,813	\$25,000	0
Travel	\$3,755	\$4,591	\$9,000	0
Allocations to Districts/Schools	0	0	0	0
Employer Contributions	\$570	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	\$43,095	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	\$24,310	\$80,961	\$21,331	0
TOTAL:	\$1,074,322	\$930,680	\$987,331	\$ 0
# FTES:	2	2	2	2

FY 2005–06 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 2004–05? *(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 2004–05 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 2004-2005 objectives were met.

Average salary for head principals has increased as follows. FY 2005: \$75,905; FY 2004: \$73,738; FY 2003: \$72,530; FY 2002: \$72,027. Average salary for assistant principals increased as follows: FY 2005: \$59,520; FY 2004: \$58,034; FY 2003: \$57,771; FY 2002: \$57,093.

3. What are the objectives of this program in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2005–06? 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 2005-2006.

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 2005–06?

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 2005–06, will be met?

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

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$0
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
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 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	0
Employer Contributions	0	0	0	0
Other: Please explain	0	0	0	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL:	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$3,095,968	\$ 0
# FTES:				

FY 2005–06 EIA Program Report

EIA Program Name: South Carolina Junior Academy of Science

Program Director: Dr. Don M. Jordan

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 2004–05? *(The goals or objectives should be in terms that can easily be quantified, evaluated and assessed.)*

SCAS 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 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 2004–05 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 (20) 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 2005 issue of SCJAS newsletter for details). ***The MESAS Mail-Contest was designed with respect to the SC Science Curriculum Guidelines. We believe this feature is in part the reason for the increase in participants from 280 to 685.***

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 Hutcheson 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 (ISEF). It is no small task to be best in the world when you are competing with the magnet schools all over the U.S. Katie Van Schaik now attends Harvard University and continues to credit the Region II Science Fair and ISEF stating "I feel like, because of the experiences I've had at the local science fair and at ISEF, I am on a level playing field with any student here [Harvard] in that area, and because I had so much experience discussing my research with judges at your science fair [Region II Science Fair], I don't feel intimidated by the prospect of speaking with people like Dr. Meselson (humbled yes, but intimidated no). In 2004 at ISEF Steven Ross Fuller, Danielle Lauren Butler and Carly Mills Rosser won First Place in the "Best Team Project" Category.

Our activities have made a difference at grade levels 4-12. In 2005 at this year's Intel ISEF (May 15-21, 2005), Patrick Hankins placed third in the Chemistry Division. To win, he had to endure nine hours of judging in which he spoke to approximately fifteen judges and then an additional four hours of presentation to the general public. Placing third in a fair of this magnitude is a huge accomplishment for the high school senior since he had to compete with 96 other competitors in his region which includes not only the best of the US, but also Germany, Brazil, Japan and other countries. His project was titled, "pH-Triggered Assembly of Gold Nanorods," and dealt with a major problem of current nanoscience research in trying to control how nanoparticles orient themselves in varying conditions. He conducted the bulk of his research at the University of South Carolina under Dr. Catherine Murphy. His school sponsor was Irmo Science Team coach, Mr. Stephen Orr. Patrick will be enrolling in the Honors College of the University of South Carolina this fall as a Carolina Scholar.

In 2005, in the Region II Science Fair, we had Five hundred Fifty-Five (555) students and one hundred twenty-six (126) teachers participating in the fair. The students were selected by over two hundred (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 of eight Regional Science Fairs in the state. Others have similar programs. [Increased number of students winning at the National Level by 100%]

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 2005 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% increase over last year) from South Carolina in the fourth Annual Science Contest in 2005, providing ample evidence that the Academy's effort to strengthen the eight science fair regions in South Carolina is making a positive difference.

Eleven (11) Students, Seven (7) from the Midlands, were chosen by the Discovery Channel Young Scientist Challenge (DCYSC) as semifinalists (400 nation-wide). These students have the knowledge, enthusiasm and imagination to become the scientific trailblazers of tomorrow," said Judith A. McHale,

President and CEO, Discovery Communications. The breadth and knowledge demonstrated by the 400 semifinalists is inspiring and sets an example for anyone who wants to explore the world around them. The eleven semifinalists from the State of South Carolina are: Brandon N. Baker (grade 7) McCants Middle School; Emily Ann Eisenstadt (Grade 8) Crayton Middle School; Spencer Bennett Skelley (grade 7) Crossroads Middle School; Trevor Warren Auman (grade 8); Chandler Matthew Barton (grade 8), and Rachitha Rajan (grade 8) all from Dent Middle School; Velina Roumenova Kozareva (grade 5) Harbison West Elementary School; Grace Carroll Zimmermann (grade 5) St. Joseph School; Erika Lynn Mino (grade 5) Pelham Road Elementary School; Anne Virginia Cai (grade 7) Porter-Gaud School; and Seth Gaston Shelton (grade 8) D. R. Hill Middle School.

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 2005–06? Explain how, if any, the objectives have changed from the prior fiscal year and why.

- To increase the number of K-12 students, teachers and schools participating in science, mathematics and engineering activities.
- To enhance the competitiveness of South Carolina students at the Annual International Science and Engineering Fairs (ISEF) (grades 9-12).
- To improve public understanding of and appreciation for the role of science, mathematics and engineering in the state.
- To expand the MESAS program from four regions to five and to update and modernize Regions I, IV & V.
- 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.
- To expand our efforts with The State Museum and coordinate events with EdVenture children's museum.
- 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.scacadsci.org. (No other such journal exists in South Carolina)
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 2005–06?

Three (3) national winners (top in their category) at International Science and Engineering Fair in the last four years

(Prior years zero).

Twenty-three (23) DCYSC semifinalists in the last four years (prior years zero).

Six hundred eighty-five (685) students state-wide competing in the SCAS MESAS Mail-in contest. (Prior year 285)

- 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.
- We will compare the number of students attending MESAS Workshops in the four MESAS regions with attendance numbers from prior years.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 competition. (Inquiry based learning.)

- To compare the number of students presenting research papers in grades 4 – 12 with states with similar programs.
- To compare the number of students who receive national recognition in 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 2005–06, will be met?

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.

- 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.
- Collaborating with the SC State Department of Education in conjunction with the state's Mathematics and Science Hubs 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.
- Publishing four editions of the SCJAS newsletter, which provides information on the Academy's activities and YRGAP.
- 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.
- The number of travel grants to students that will support their attendance at MESAS, SCJAS, and SCAS workshops will be increased.
- The number of awards and prizes for meritorious research that is presented by students at the SCAS/SCJAS annual meeting will be increased.
- 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.
- Establishing one additional MESAS regional site and updating & modernizing MESAS Regions I, IV, & V.
- 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.
- The number of teacher sponsors and observers at ISEF will be increased to support the students.
- A mechanism for students and teachers to share judging experiences at ISEF will be developed and initiated.
- The age at which students are allowed to participate at regional science fairs will be lowered.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Representatives from existing MESAS regions will be recruited to provide assistance to these planning committees.
- 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.

6. Detailed Budget and Expenditure History.

Funding Sources	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
EIA	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
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	0
Other (Specify) SCAS is non-profit (fees are absorbed in the operations of the programs	0	0	0	0
Carry Forward from Prior Year	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$ 0

Expenditures	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Actual	2005-06 Estimated	2006-07 Estimated
Personal Service	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$0
Supplies & Materials	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	0
Contractual Services	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	0
Equipment	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	0
Fixed Charges	0	0	0	0
Travel	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	0
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	0
Budget Reduction	0	0	0	0
Balance Remaining	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$106,000	\$ 0
#FTES				