

SCSL Digital Collections

Annual update to the EOC funding model

Item Type	Text
Publisher	South Carolina State Library
Rights	Copyright status undetermined. For more information contact, South Carolina State Library, 1500 Senate Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.
Download date	2024-11-08 12:48:47
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10827/5169

Annual Update to the EOC Funding Model

April 11, 2011

Authority

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) bears statutory responsibility to, among other tasks,

make programmatic and funding recommendations to the General Assembly;
report annually to the General Assembly, State Board of Education, and the public on the progress of the programs;
recommend Education Accountability Act and EIA program changes to state agencies and other entities as it considers necessary. (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-10).

The statutes further require the EOC's Division of Accountability to

monitor and evaluate the functioning of the public education system and its components, programs, policies, and practices and report annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the commission no later than February first of each year (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-110).

Background

In December of 2003 the EOC requested that the staff propose a revised funding model for public education. The model was developed to respond to five questions:

1. What is the educational program mandated in statute or regulation?
2. What is the cost of the educational program in an average school district or school?
3. Are there ways to spend public dollars to foster higher achievement?
4. What dollars in the public domain are dedicated to schools and districts?
5. What is the state-district balance in educational spending?

The model is based on the following assumptions:

- All services to children in public schools, as required by state law and regulation, are provided with all costs reflected in the base student cost.
- The pupil teacher ratio in **all** grades is 21:1 with additional teachers needed for smaller class sizes for special needs children. The additional costs for providing smaller class sizes are paid for with existing special education weights.
- The average teacher salary in South Carolina is set at the Southeastern average teacher salary as determined annually by the Budget and Control Board. The salaries for all other professional and administrative staff are based upon the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region as determined by Educational Research Service.
- All state appropriations that support components of the base student cost would be consolidated and used to fund the model.

- The model is based upon the following enrollments for a district and for elementary, middle and high schools. Table 1 compares the EOC model enrollments with the mean and median enrollments as reported on the 2009 school and district report cards. Excluded from the calculations were the South Carolina Public Charter School District (SCPCSD) and schools in the schools in the SCPCSD due to duplications of enrollment data across grade levels.

Table 1
Enrollment Comparisons

	EOC Model	n=	2009 Actual Mean	2009 Actual Median
District	7,500	85	8,314	4,584
Elementary School	500	635	528	511
Middle School	750	297	571	540
High School	900	212	989	878

*There are an additional 36 primary schools not reflected in these numbers

Not included in the EOC base student cost are costs associated with the following:

- School building construction;
- Food services;
- Technical assistance to underperforming schools (coaches, specialists, homework centers, etc.);
- Arts and foreign language instruction;
- Extracurricular activities such as sports and clubs; and
- Operation and maintenance of the school bus fleet.

2010 Updates

Annually the model is updated to reflect salary changes, best practices research and legislative actions. The 2010 model is based upon a projected Southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,725 which is a 1.1 percent increase over last year’s projected Southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,172. The salaries for administrative and support staff are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in comparable positions in the Southeast region as reported by Education Research Services.

The Appendix enumerates each state law and regulation and estimates a per pupil cost based on the model’s enrollments across the district and across grade levels. There were no statutory changes made during the 2010 legislative session that had monetary impacts on the funding model. Table 2 reflects the costs per student as generated by the model in 2010 as compared to 2009.

Table 2
Estimated Base Student Cost

District/Grade Levels	2010 Cost per Student	2009 Cost Per Student
District	\$1,943.03	\$1,929.63
Grades K-5 (Elementary)	\$4,149.30	\$4,073.17
Grades 6-8 (Middle School)	\$4,131.60	\$4,009.05
Grades 9-12 (High School)	\$4,138.68	\$4,079.29

The “district cost per student” includes the costs of instructional supplies, operation and maintenance of school buildings, district office staff, local school board expenses, technology, and local costs of school bus transportation. Sixty percent or \$1,157 of the total district cost reflects expenses for operating and maintaining school buildings including utilities, upkeep, etc. The district costs associated with operations, instructional supplies, and transportation are based upon In\$ite data as reported by the South Carolina Department of Education from audited school district financial reports. For the current update, In\$ite data for school year 2008-09 was used.

The variations in cost per student across grade levels reflect less than a one percent difference in the costs of educating an “average” child in an elementary school versus the cost of educating an “average” child in middle school. Consequently, the base student cost of the EOC model is the sum of the districts costs per student of \$1,943.03, and \$4,149.30, which is the highest cost of direct instructional services to students. The result is a base student cost of \$6,092. This figure represents a 1.4 percent increase above the model’s base student cost of \$6,008 in 2009 (Table 3). In comparison, the Office of Research and Statistics projected the Education Finance Act (EFA) inflation factor for educational goods and services for FY2010-11 to be 1.23 percent.

Table 3
Base Student Cost Projections Since 2003

Year	Base Student Cost
2003	\$5,239
2004	\$5,347
2005	\$5,657
2006	\$5,311
2007	\$5,606
2008	\$5,800
2009	\$6,008
2010	\$6,092

In addition to a revised base student cost, the EOC funding model also recommended changes to the EFA weights.

General educational weights were assigned for each student which is essentially the base student cost for “average” students in grades K through 12. Looking at the costs of services across elementary, middle and high schools, the staff determined that the weight for all students, including homebound students, should be changed to 1.0. Again, as shown in the costs per student data, the difference between the costs of educating a child across the various grade levels is less than one percent. Each student enrolled in public schools would receive one of these general educational weights. Weights for children with disabilities remain the same as currently established in the EFA. However, the EOC staff recommends amending the classification descriptors to reflect appropriate educational classifications. For example, all references to “handicapped” should be changed to “disabled.”

Add-On Compensatory weights address the contexts or factors that detract from high achievement over time. These weights are in addition to the general educational program weights. There are two categories of compensatory weights in the EOC model that address the specific needs of:

1. Children in Poverty - A compensatory weight of 0.20 is included for children in poverty. Poverty is defined as children eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program and/or eligible for Medicaid. Researchers estimate that the cost of teaching low-income students using a nationally recognized program such as Success for All or Roots and Wings is an additional \$1,200 per pupil. According to the annual school report cards, statewide the poverty index in 2009-10 was 67.14. In South Carolina 67.14 percent of all students in the public schools were eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program and/or Medicaid.
2. Children with Limited English Proficiency - A weight of 0.20 is included for students with limited English proficiency who require intensive English language instruction programs and whose families require specialized parental involvement intervention. This weight was derived based on national reports documenting how states allocate funds for services to students with limited English proficiency.

Add-On Program weights, which are in addition to the general educational weights and the compensatory weights, fund programs designed to address individual student academic or artistic challenges and include programs for students needing:

1. Academic Assistance - A weight of 0.15 is included for students who do not meet state standards on mathematics, English language arts or both to guarantee that the students receive additional tutoring, additional hours of instruction in summer school, extended school year, etc. In 2010 there were 119,860 students in grades 3 through 8 who scored “Not Met” on the reading, mathematics or both sections of the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). It should be noted that 24,985 of these students were not in poverty. In addition there were another 10,586 students who did not pass the English language arts, mathematics or both sections of the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) on their first attempt in 2010.
2. Gifted and Talented – A weight of 0.15 is recommended to provide services to students who are classified as academically or artistically gifted and talented or who are enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses in high school.
3. Young Adult Education - Adults aged 17 to 21 who are pursuing a diploma or GED through adult education or other means but are no longer part of the regular school setting would be funded at a weight of 0.20. The model assumed that adult education for individuals over age 21 would be provided through a separate appropriation to the South Carolina Department of Education, the technical college system, or a workforce agency.

Table 4 compares the current EFA weights with the weights of the EOC model.

**Table 4
Comparison of Current EFA Weights with Weights of the EOC Funding Model**

Classifications	Current EFA Weights	EOC Model Weights
General Education Weights:		
K-5	Kindergarten, 1.30 Primary (1-3), 1.24	1.0
Grades 6-8	Elementary (4-8) 1.00	1.0
Grades 9-12	1.25	1.0
Disabilities:		
Mild Intellectual Disabled	1.74	1.74
Moderate Intellectual Disabled	2.04	2.04
Emotionally Disabled	2.04	2.04
Visually Disabled	2.57	2.57
Hearing Disabled	2.57	2.57
Orthopedically Disabled	2.04	2.04
Speech	1.90	1.90
Autism	2.57	2.57
Homebound	2.10	1.0
Vocational		1.2
V1	1.29	
V2	1.29	
V3	1.29	
Compensatory Weights:		
Poverty *		.20
Limited English Proficient		.20
Program Weights:		
Gifted and Talented (Grades 3-12)*		.15
Remediation *		.15
Adult Education 17 to 21 year-olds *		.20

* Currently three line items in the EIA budget for Fiscal Year 2010-11 provide partial funding for these initiatives and total \$176.4 million. These specific line items are for: High Achieving Students (\$26,268,246); Students at Risk of School Failure (\$136,163,204); and Adult Education (\$13,573,736). EIA appropriations for Students at Risk of School Failure are allocated to districts based on two factors: (1) the poverty index of the district; and (2) the number of students not in poverty or not eligible for Medicaid but who fail to meet state standards in either reading or mathematics.

Based upon the 135 day average daily membership for school year 2009-10, the number of weighted pupil units generated by the EOC model were calculated and updated. Table 5 documents the projected number of weighted pupil units (WPU). The projected number of students needing academic assistance was updated to reflect the 2010 administration of the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) in grades 3 through 8 and the 2010 administration of the High School Assessment Program (HSAP). The total number of weighted pupil units increased by 1 percent from 919,651 in 2009 to 927,518 in 2010. For comparison purposes, the Budget and Control Board in December 2010 revised its estimate of the total number of weighted pupil units for Fiscal Year 2011-12 to 865,782, an increase of 0.3 percent above the Fiscal Year 2009-10 weighted pupil unit count of 863,149.

Table 5
Weighted Pupil Units by ADM and Classifications

Classifications	EOC Model Weights	ADM	WPU¹
Kindergarten	1.0	47,292.15	47,292.15
Grades 1-3	1.0	139,877.96	139,877.96
Grades 4-8	1.0	230,986.84	230,986.84
Grades 9-12	1.0	78,437.64	78,437.64
	1.0		
Handicapped			
Disabilities	Vary by disability	59,329.62	170,271.15
Homebound	1.0	2,206.95	2,206.95
Vocational	1.2	100,400.09	120,480.11
TOTAL General Education WPU^s			789,552.80
Poverty (K-12)	.20	461,931.00	92,386.20
Non-English Speaking	.20	32275.00	6,455.00
TOTAL Compensatory WPU^s			98,841.20
Gifted and Talented (3-12)	.15	111,438.00	16,715.70
Academic Remediation	.15	130,446.00	19,566.90
Adult Education 17 to 21 year-olds	.20	14,209.00	2,841.80
TOTAL Program WPU^s			39,124.40
ALL WPU^s			927,518.40

Based upon the revised base student cost and weighted pupil units, the total cost to fund the EOC model in 2010 is \$5.65 billion as shown in Table 6. The cost is determined by multiplying the base student cost of \$6,092 by the total number of weighted pupil units, 927,518. For comparison purposes, the total number of weighted pupil units in Fiscal Year 2009-10 was 863,149.

Table 6
Cost of Weights at Base Student Cost of \$6,092

General Education Weights	789,553	\$4,809,956,876
Compensatory Weights	98,841	\$602,139,372
Program Weights	39,124	\$238,343,408
TOTAL	927,518	\$5,650,439,656

Table 7 summarizes the changes in the model over time.

¹ Rounded to nearest whole number.

Table 7
Base Student Cost of EOC Funding Model over Time

Year	Base Student Cost	Projected Teacher Salary	Total Weighted Pupil Units²
2003	\$5,239	\$40,959	825,971
2004	\$5,347	\$42,737	839,493
2005	\$5,657	\$43,991	836,837
2006	\$5,311	\$43,991	905,923
2007	\$5,606	\$45,479	911,020
2008	\$5,800	\$47,304	914,483
2009	\$6,008	\$48,172	919,651
2010	\$6,092	\$48,725	927,518

For comparison purposes, in Fiscal Year 2008-09 school districts received revenues from the following sources as illustrated in Table 8.³ Excluded are intergovernmental revenues, which are payments from other governmental units including the Office of First Steps that totaled \$56,808,006. Also excluded are “Other Revenues” which total \$1,448,612,510 and reflect the sale of general obligation bonds. “State Revenues” are general fund, Education Improvement Act and lottery appropriations as well as reimbursements from local property tax relief. In Fiscal Year 2008-09 school districts received \$6.8 billion in state and local revenues, which exceeds the total cost of the EOC funding model by approximately \$1.2 billion. Between 2007-08 and 2008-09 total revenues were essentially flat. *It should be noted that local funds provide programs and initiatives that are not addressed by the EOC funding model and are implemented at the discretion of local school districts.*

Table 8
Revenues to School Districts

Source	Fiscal Year 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2007-08
State	\$3,585,485,523	\$3,786,664,032
Local	\$3,218,070,701	\$3,087,430,111
Federal	\$761,286,747	\$714,553,010
TOTAL	\$7,564,842,971	\$7,588,647,153

Looking at expenditures by school districts, In\$ite, the Financial Analysis Model for Education, analyzes “100 percent of a school district's general ledger.”⁴ In\$ite excludes district expenditures for capital and out-of-district obligations. In\$ite further analyzes all expenditures by five categories:

- Instruction – face-to-face teaching (instructional teachers, substitutes, instructional paraprofessionals) and classroom materials (pupil-use technology and software and instructional materials and supplies)
- Instructional Support, - pupil support (guidance and counseling; library and media; extracurricular; and student health services), teacher support

² Rounded to the nearest whole number.

³ South Carolina Department of Education, Office of Finance. <<http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Finance-and-Operations/Finance/old/finance/HistoricalData.html>>.

⁴ South Carolina Department of Education. “In\$ite.” <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Finance-and-Operations/Finance/old/finance/insite/>.

(curriculum development, in-service and staff training), and program support (therapists, psychologists, evaluators, and social workers).

- Operations – transportation, food service, safety, building upkeep and maintenance, data processing and business operations
- Other Commitments debt service, capital projects, payments to charter school districts, retiree benefits, claims and settlements
- Leadership – principals, assistant principals, school office, deputies, senior administrators, researchers, program evaluators, superintendent and school board, and legal.

According to In\$ite data for 2008-09, school districts expended \$6,603,587,801 on these five categories of direct educational services and another \$2,077,407,879 on capital projects, debt service and other obligations (Table 9).

Table 9
In\$ite Data, 2008-09

Category:	Total Expenditures	Per Pupil Expenditures	% of Total
Instruction	\$3,781,360,842	\$5,317	57.26%
Instructional Support	\$917,504,511	\$1,290	13.89%
Operations	\$1,345,258,524	\$1,892	20.37%
Other Commitments	681,418	\$1	0.01%
Leadership	\$558,782,443	\$786	8.46%
TOTAL:	\$6,603,587,801	\$9,286	100.0%
Additional:	Total Expenditures	Per Pupil Expenditures	
Debt Service	\$762,651,245	\$1,072	
Capital Projects	\$1,237,419,493	\$1,740	
Parochial, private, charter & publics school Pass Throughs	\$77,337,141	\$109	
TOTAL:	\$2,077,407,879	\$2,921	

New Information

Each year the EOC staff reviews and reports on national research as well as state initiatives related directly to components of the EOC funding model.

English Language Learners – Grantmakers for Education (GFE) is a national network of over 240 private and public grant-making organizations that support education. Among the members of GFE are the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. GFE provides research, programs and resources to assist its members in awarding grants for proposals that improve educational outcomes. A recent report by GFE addresses the opportunities and challenges facing students who are English Language Learners (ELL). GFE reported:

- 1 in 10 of all preK-12 students are ELL;
- While many immigrants are ELLs, the majority of ELL students are U.S.-born. More than 75 percent of elementary ELL students are second-generation or even third-generation Americans. More than one in five children in the U.S. has at least one immigrant parent.

95 percent of children under the age of six who live in immigrant families are born in the U.S.;

- South Carolina has the fastest-growing ELL population in the United States.;
- Achieving fluency is only the first step in attaining academic proficiency in English. Acquiring conversational fluency can take one to three years. Academic literacy – moving from “learning to read” to “reading to learn” – can take five to seven years.⁵

Educational Efficiencies – The Center for American Progress (CAP), a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank, issued in January 2011 *Return on Educational Investment: A District-by-district Evaluation of U.S. Educational Productivity*. As described by CAP, “the report “is the culmination of a yearlong effort to study the efficiency of the nation’s public education system and includes the first-ever attempt to evaluate the productivity of almost every major school district in the country.”⁶

The report used 2007-08 school finance data from the National Center for Education Statistics. The finance data included money from all revenue sources, federal, state but excluded capital expenses as well as payment to private schools and charter schools. An achievement index was developed by “averaging together the percent of students designated proficient or above on the state assessment in reading and math in fourth grade, eighth grade and high school for the 2007-08 school year.”⁷ Then districts within a state were evaluated using three rankings:

1. Basic Return on Investment Index Rating – measures how much academic achievement each district got for each dollar spent, relative to other districts in their state;
2. Adjusted Return on Investment Index Rating – applies a regression analysis to account for factors outside a district’s control, such as the added costs of educating low-income, non-English speaking and special education students; and
3. Predicted Efficiency Index Rating – rates districts on the results of their predicted achievement after controlling for factors outside their control. “The first two approaches attempt to measure how much ‘bang for the buck’ a school district gets. This third approach attempts to eliminate the effects of spending and other factors such as student with additional needs and then evaluates districts by how much more or less achievement the district produced than would be expedited.”⁸

The findings of the report are summarized below:

- Many school districts could boost student achievement without increasing spending if they used their money more productively.
- Low productivity costs the nation’s school system as much as \$175 billion a year.
- Without controls on how additional school dollars are spent, more education spending will not automatically improve student outcomes.
- Efficiency varies widely within states.
- More than a million students are enrolled in highly inefficient districts.
- High-spending school systems are often inefficient.

⁵ “Investing in Our Next Generation: A Funder’s Guide to Addressing the Educational Opportunities and Challenges Facing English Language Learners.” Grantmakers for Education.
<http://edfunders.org/downloads/GFEReports/GFE_Investing_in_Our_Next_Generation.pdf>.

⁶ Boser, Ulrich, *Return on Educational Investment: A District-by-district Evaluation of U.S. Educational Productivity*.” January 2011. <<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/01/pdf/dwwroi.pdf>>.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

- Students from disadvantaged backgrounds are more likely to be enrolled in highly inefficient districts.
- High productive districts are focused on improving student outcomes.
- States and districts fail to evaluate the productivity of school districts. The quality of state and local education data is often poor.
- The nation’s least-productive districts spend more on administration.
- Some urban districts are far more productive than others.⁹

Comparing productivity among states, the CAP report finds that “41 states show the potential for double-digit percentage increases in achievement without necessarily spending additional funds.” Table 10 summarizes the potential achievement gains in states in the Southeast if funds were spent more productively. The CAP report also found that “only two states, Florida and Texas, currently provide annual school-level productivity evaluations, which report to the public how well funds are being spent at the local level.”¹⁰

Table 10
State Spending and Productivity Indicators of Southeastern States¹¹

State	Difference in spending between all districts in state	Difference in Spending among all Top Achievers	% Achievement Increase if a district moves from least to most productive
Alabama	\$3,180	\$3,896	11%
Florida	\$3,575	\$3,131	18%
Georgia	\$3,327	\$2,920	8%
Mississippi	\$3,687	\$3,068	27%
North Carolina	\$3,604	\$3,513	15%
South Carolina	\$2,662	\$2,803	12%
Tennessee	\$2,652	\$2,835	8%
Virginia	\$4,106	\$2,424	9%

Regarding Texas, in 2009 the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 3 which directed the Comptroller of Public Accounts to “identify school districts and campuses that use resource allocation practices that contribute to high academic achievement and cost-effective operations.” In December 2010 the Comptroller issued the Financial Allocation Study for Texas (FAST) report.

FAST compared school districts using “fiscal peers” or “up to 40 districts or campuses that operate in similar cost environments, based on factors that affect the cost of providing education, such as regional wages, district size and student characteristics.” Within the peers a spending index and a composite academic progress percentile were calculated for each district. First, each district was assigned a spending index that ranged from Very Low to Very High based on core operating expenditures per pupil, adjusted for geographic wage variations. The financial data was a three-year average. Second, a composite academic progress percentile that measured annual progress in reading/English Language Arts and math in percentiles from one to 99 over three years was calculated for each district. There were four percentiles of academic progress: 80 to 99; 60 to 79; 40 to 59; 20 to 39; and less than 20. Finally, the two

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid, Table A2, pages 44-45.

measures (spending index and academic progress percentile) were then used to assign FAST rating of between one and five-stars (Table 11).

Table 11
Composite Academic Progress Percentile + Spending Index = FAST Rating¹²

		SPENDING INDEX				
		Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low
COMPOSITE ACADEMIC PROGRESS PERCENTILE	80 to 99	3 Stars	3 ½ Stars	4 Stars	4 ½ Stars	5 Stars
	60 to 79	2 ½ Stars	3 Stars	3 ½ Stars	4 Stars	4 ½ Stars
	40 to 59	2 Stars	2 ½ Stars	3 Stars	3 ½ Stars	4 Stars
	20 to 39	1 ½ Stars	2 Stars	2 ½ Stars	3 Stars	3 ½ Stars
	Less than 20	1 Star	1 ½ Stars	2 Stars	2 ½ Stars	3 Stars

FAST also identified and reported “smart practices” that were implemented by the five-star districts. As described in the report, “the secrets to their success are practices that:

- have proven to be an effective practice for containing, reducing or avoiding costs;
- improve the efficiency and effectiveness of educational program delivery, including demonstrated improvement in student performance;
- are estimated to produce a significant long-term return on investment for the district;
- have significantly increased purchasing power through the use of purchasing partnerships;
- have realized efficiencies through the use of shared services arrangements with other districts; and/or
- can be implemented by other districts.”¹³

The specific smart practices were grouped according to the following four topics and posted online at <http://fastexas.org/smartPractices/staff.php> with information on the enrollment of the district, a summary of the cost-saving measure, the amount of savings generated, and a link to the district’s website.

- Instruction and staffing;
- Financial management and technology solutions;
- Purchasing and student services; and
- Facilities.

Under Consideration by the South Carolina General Assembly

The General Assembly is also currently considering legislation to amend the school finance formula.

S.433 – On February 24, 2010 the K-12 Subcommittee of the Senate Education Committee reported out favorably with amendments, S. 433. S.433 includes the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on K-12 Funding, a special committee appointed by Senator John

¹² <http://fastexas.org/overview/>.

¹³ Ibid.

Courson, Chairman of the Senate Select Committee, in June of 2010 and chaired by Senator Wes Hayes. The full Senate Education Committee will consider the bill and proposed amendments on March 9, 2011. The key components of the bill are:

- Revision of the current EFA weights to incorporate the EOC funding model weights;
- Revision of the Index of Taxpaying Ability to impute values received by school districts per Act 388 and as stipulated in S.310, a joint resolution that was introduced as a result of the work and recommendations of the Index of Taxpaying Ability Committee, created by proviso 1.88. of the 2010-11 General Appropriations Act;
- Inclusion of add-on weights for the South Carolina Public Charter School District (SCPCSD) of .62 for students in virtual schools and .93 for students in brick and mortar schools and weights for students in residential treatment facilities of 2.10;
- Codification of financial flexibility and deregulation for school districts; and
- Development of a framework by the State Board of Education through regulation by which a local school district may implement an incentive compensation system for teachers.

H.3716 – A bill introduced by the Ways and Means Committee, H.3716 also amends the Education Finance Act accordingly:

- Redefines the base student cost and basic education program to include, but not be limited to, specific legislation enacted by the General Assembly;
- Amends the Index of Taxpaying Ability to include imputed values received by school districts per Act 388 and to exclude from the property value of each district property that has been in bankruptcy status for at least thirty consecutive months;
- Amends the EFA weights per the EOC funding model with the following exceptions: (1) the poverty weighting is 0.25 rather than 0.20; (2) the academic assistance weight is .17 rather than .15; and (3) students in residential treatment facilities are weighted at 2.10. There are no add-on weights for students in the South Carolina Public Charter School District. The House is considering other legislation to increase funding of the SCPCSD.
- Funds all add-on weights at 100 percent state funding; and
- Requires the Department of Education to form a committee based on specific representatives from the Palmetto State Teachers Association, the South Carolina Education Association and the current state teacher of the year to develop an incentive compensation plan for teachers and to report its findings to the legislature.

The House has adjourned debate on the bill until March 1.

APPENDIX

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Across School/District Enrollment

Analysis of State Requirements of Schools and Districts

Costs Reflect Requirements of Statute, Regulation and FY 2010-11 General Appropriations Act

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS:

1. This model is built upon the following assumed enrollments: Elementary (K-5) = 500; Middle (6-8) = 750; High (9-12) = 900; and District enrollment of 7,500. According to the 2009 district and school report cards, for those schools receiving a report card, the mean enrollment for districts and schools is as follows: District = 8,383; Elementary = 528; Middle = 569; and High = 985.
2. SCDE reports that in 2009-10 the poverty index for the state was 67.14. Approximately 67.14 percent of all public schools students were eligible for the free or reduced price Federal lunch program and/or Medicaid.
3. The most recent available data are used for cost projections and include: FY09 In\$ite data; 2009 and 2010 school and district report cards as available; and the 2009-10 Funding Manual published by the South Carolina Department of Education.
4. Estimates of teachers needed are rounded to the next highest half of a teacher.
5. Salaries for classroom teachers and physical education teachers are based on Fiscal Year 2010-11 projected Southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,725.
6. Unless noted, salaries for support staff are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2009-10 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.
7. All fringe benefits are calculated at 28% of the salary of all personnel.
8. Cost of five additional days for classroom teachers determined by calculating the cost of one day of salary, \$48,725, divided by 190; then adding 28% for fringe benefits, the cost per day for is \$328. The cost of the additional five days is \$1,640 per teacher.
9. The statewide base student cost is rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The total state weighted pupil unit count projects are rounded to the nearest whole number.
10. The total 135-day average daily membership for Fiscal Year 2009-10 was 688,012.33. Estimates of ADM by grade level were: K-5 = 279,564.85; Grades 6-8 = 138,592.10; and Grades 9-12, 78,437.64.

SCHOOLS GENERALLY

The actual base student cost for FY 2009-10 was \$1,756.47. According to Proviso 1.3 the base student cost for FY2010-11 was \$1,630; however, due to increases in the number of weighted pupil units, the base student cost funded was revised downward to \$1,617 in December 2010. The actual base student cost as projected by the Office of Research and Statistics for FY 2009-10 was \$2,720. Provisos 1.5 and 1.6 pertain to the funding of employer contributions.

59-1-425 establishes a school term of 180 days of instruction with the instructional day at a minimum of six hours a day, excluding lunch. The law stipulates ten days of inservice training for teachers of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences. Based on FY09 In\$ite data, per pupil expenditures for professional development were \$328 in the state.

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
59-17-135 Each district must have a character education policy	No additional cost				
59-19-20 Each district must have a board composed of at least three members	Average compensation per board member is \$123.24 per meeting. With three board members and twelve meetings per year, the total cost is \$4,436.64 /year.			\$4,436.64	\$0.59
59-19-45 Each new school district member must participate in orientation	Statewide the cost of training is \$151,570 or \$1,783 per district.			\$1,783.00	\$0.24
59-20-60/R43-261 Each district and school must develop a school renewal/improvement plan and operate a School Improvement Council	No additional cost				
59-24-30 Each administrator must complete an individual professional development plan	No additional cost				
59-13-60/R43-209 Each school district must employ a chief administrative officer and secretary. Superintendent also has requirements under EAA, EEDA, student expulsion laws, Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act, etc.	1.0 Superintendent Note: The mean average is for contract salary. Many superintendents receive additional compensation such as an annuity payment.	\$165,553		\$211,907.84	\$28.25
	1.0 District Secretary	\$34,493		\$44,151.04	\$5.89
59-29-30 / R43-238 Courses of instruction with supplementary instruction in alcohol and drug abuse prevention, traffic laws, fire prevention, physical education/ROTC,	Within funding for minimum program				

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
emphasis on teaching as a profession					
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented by: (1) February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding; and (2) 1978 internal Department of Education memo.	1.0 Full-time Fiscal Officer	\$97,089		\$124,273.92	\$16.57
	1.0 Secretary	\$34,493		\$44,151.04	\$5.89
	1.0 Director for Planning	\$97,724		\$125,086.72	\$16.68
	1.0 Assistant Superintendent	\$115,276		\$147,553.28	\$19.67
	1.0 Program Consultant	\$97,089		\$124,273.92	\$16.57
	3.0 Secretary	\$34,493		\$132,453.12	\$17.66
Section 59-59-105 of the EEDA implies that school districts will employ an individual to coordinate career awareness for all students grades K-12	1.0 Coordinator for Career Services	\$72,677		\$93,026.56	\$12.40
Section 59-59-60 of the EEDA requires districts to organize curriculum into clusters	No additional cost; responsibilities of coordinator for career services				
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented in the February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding	Maintenance and operational costs exclude food service which is funded through federal funds and auxiliary revenues. Across districts, the mean per pupil expenditure for safety, building upkeep and maintenance, data processing and business operations is \$1,157 as reported for FY09 on In\$ite.			\$8,677,500.00	\$1,157.00
Original DMP	Office support costs. The original EFA estimate is \$12 per student, increased by inflation over 30 years to \$31.17 in FY10			\$233,775.00	\$31.17

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-20-40 and R43-172 requires districts to account for every pupil according to the EFA classifications in each school	Requires annual financial audit of district and school financial records. The average audit fees per school district were \$38,410 as reported by SCDE, "Listing of 2009-2010 LEA General Fund Balances and Audit Fees."			\$38,410.00	\$5.12
59-32-30 (R43-238) Comprehensive health education: advisory committee and instruction	Estimated at 2 meetings annually with \$100 per meeting for materials and postage			\$200.00	\$0.03
59-24-80 Each new principal must participate in a formal induction program (R43-167)	About 100 individuals participate in the New Principals Academy each year; estimate at 1.2 new principals per district			\$120.00	\$0.02
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented in the February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding	Instructional Supplies : \$25 per student for books purchased for media center/library; \$135 per student for textbooks purchased in addition to state-adopted textbooks, maps, consumables, etc. (FY09 In\$ite data documents an average expenditure per pupil of \$160 for instructional materials and supplies.)			\$1,200,000.00	\$160.00
Computer Hardware: R 43-232 Defined program for grades 6-8 requires keyboarding, computer literacy; R43-233 establishes Career and Technology Education; R43-234 Defined program for grades 9-12 requires computer science including keyboarding as one of the 24 units of credit	Based on FY09 In\$ite data, \$95 per pupil was expended for pupil-use technology and software. Would include cost of replacing one-fifth or 20% of the computers used for a computer/student ratio of 1 computer per 3.6 students.			\$712,500.00	\$95.00

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
needed for graduation; and Section 59-59-50 of EEDA requires career clusters that specifically address technology					
R43-80 : Student transportation	Transportation costs borne by the state. District salary differential and other travel of \$249 per pupil based on FY09 In\$ite data			\$1,867,500.00	\$249.00
59-1-450: Each school district must offer a parenting family literacy program (R43-265)	Distribution is based upon minimum of \$40,000 to each district serving more than 2,000 students plus \$4 per pupil for districts exceeding 2,000 students			\$70,000.00	\$9.33
59-28-160 Each district/school must provide an orientation and training for all faculty and staff on parental involvement	Cost estimated at \$500 / day for consultant services for 2-hour training program per school and materials of \$100 per school		12	\$7,200.00	\$0.96
Code citations include references to technology as state goals, the actual teaching of students in technology and use of technology in classroom instruction (Section 59-59-50, 59-31-40, 59-63-1350 and 59-114-10)	In FY10, funds for technology were not allocated to districts but used on behalf of districts for Power School implementation. In FY11, \$10,171,826 in EIA funds were appropriated for technology which equates to \$14.61 per 696,022 students (135-ADM for FY10).			\$109,575.00	\$14.61

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
Sections 59-63-1300 through 59-63-1400	Alternative School: allocation built on 1.74 of base student cost (including regular base student cost). Estimated 1% of student population eligible for program. Using FY10 projected base student cost of \$2,720 per pupil allocation is projected to be \$4,733		75	\$354,975.00	\$47.33
R43-205.1 ADEPT program	ADEPT, including induction year. District enrollment divided by 1:21 teacher: pupil ratio. Then project one-third of teachers evaluated annually. Each teacher has three evaluators who spend at least one additional work day on the evaluations Using \$48,725 as the salary of the teacher and a 190-day contract, each day costs \$328 per evaluator including fringe benefits. The three days cost \$985 per teacher being evaluated.		119	\$117,261.90	\$15.63
59-18-900 Reporting requirements for annual school and district report card	Fall 2002 Nat'l Conference on State Legislatures estimate: "\$5-10 per pupil" for No Child Left Behind			\$56,250.00	\$7.50
Section 59-53-1950 and Section 59-53-1960 Career and Technology Education Equipment	FY10 total funds \$6,766,124. Allocation formula: \$20,000 per district. Remaining funds distributed to districts and career centers based on prior year student enrollments for career and technology education courses. Estimate 25% of all students in SC in a CATE class based on enrollment patterns which equates to \$29 per pupil		1875	\$74,375.00	\$9.92
Total DISTRICT COSTS TO BE ADDED TO SCHOOL COSTS					\$1,943.03

OTHER DISTRICT COSTS:

School Building Aid Program Section 59-21-320 requires annual appropriation of \$30 per student in grades 1 through 12 and \$15 per kindergarten student for capital improvements. Sections 59-21-355, 59-21-420 and 59-21-430 relate to the appropriation of EIA funds for school building purposes. Section 59-21-450 requires all unexpended EIA funds to be reallocated to school building aid program.

Salary* - Teacher salaries based on 2010-11 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2009-10 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Maximum daily teaching load per teacher is 150 students with no class exceeding 35 students.	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Dividing school enrollment by 21 .	\$48,725	43	\$2,672,914.29	\$2,969.90
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers' supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		4		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for Teachers	FY09 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$328 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a cursory review of graduate programs at public colleges and universities, the following was found. At the College of Charleston, part-time graduates pay \$324 per credit hour. At Clemson, academic fees average \$365 per credit hour for part-time graduate students. An average of \$350 was used.		47	\$16,462.50	\$18.29
Proviso 1A.17. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		47	\$12,934.82	\$14.37

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of in-service training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,725 a teacher is compensated or \$328 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,640.		47	\$77,080.00	\$85.64
Regulation 43-205 a certified principal/director in schools/campuses with more than 250 students	1.0 Principal	\$94,803		\$121,347.84	\$134.83
Regulation 43-205 assistant principal in each school with an enrollment of 500 or more students must be staffed with at least one full-time properly certified assistant principal/assistant director and a properly certified assistant principal or the equivalent for each additional 500 students.	2.0 Assistant Principals	\$73,228		\$187,463.68	\$208.29
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,889		\$35,697.92	\$39.66
	1.0 Attendance Clerk/Bookkeeper	\$19,418		\$24,855.04	\$27.62
Regulation 43-205 Two full-time library/media specialist in schools with more than 750 students	2.0 Library/Media Specialists	\$53,837		\$137,822.72	\$153.14
Section 59-59-100 one guidance counselor for every 300 students in high schools; Section 59-59-110 requires implementation of career guidance program	Guidance Counselors	\$55,097	3.0	\$211,572.48	\$235.08

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-66-20 School Safety Coordinator	Original allocation was \$20,500; however, program no longer has separate appropriation. Cost based on midpoint of salary range for a Law Enforcement Officer I which is a pay band of 4 (Source: Office of Human Resources, February 9, 2011)	\$35,457		\$45,384.96	\$50.43
Section 59-59-100 one career specialist in every high school beginning with the 2006-07 school year.	1.0 Career Specialist (Based on salary that is being funded in FY10)	\$40,747		\$52,156.16	\$57.95
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools (\$25 per child)			\$22,500.00	\$25.00
Section 59-39-100 Requires 24 units for high school graduation	Prior to Fiscal Year 2009-10, a separate line item appropriation was included in the state budget to assist schools in meeting the 24 units for graduation. These funds were consolidated into one line item totaling \$21,956,313 and reallocated based on total WPU's in each district. The model would recommend allocating these funds between middle and high schools based on the 135-day ADM (217,029.70) to fund the extra 24 units, which equates to \$101.17.			\$91,053.00	\$101.17
Section 59-39-310 Requires driver's education course	\$30 per eligible student		225	\$6,750.00	\$7.50
Section 59-18-350 / Provisos 1.27, 1.30., and 1A.26. Allocations for PSAT/PLAN	\$10 per exam for all 10th graders		225	\$2,250.00	\$2.50

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
administration					
Section 59-139-10 and Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 9-12 and Proviso 1A.38.	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded with add-on weights. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are limited English proficient are also funded with add-on weights.				
Section 59-18-500 refer to summer school as part of a student's academic plan; Regulation 43-240					
Regulation 43-258.1 and Proviso 1A.37.					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 and Proviso 1A.37.					
	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50 .		225	\$1,012.50	\$1.13
Section 59-59-130 of EEDA requires by school year 2009-10 the implementation of High Schools that Work in every high school	In FY10 all mature high schools received \$2,500 per school while new high school received \$8,600 per school. The average is \$5,550. Total state allocation was \$2,177,940 and included funding for middle schools at same levels.			\$5,550.00	\$6.17
Total for High School					\$4,138.68

Salary* - Teacher salaries based on 2010-11 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2009-10 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Prevents any class from having more than 35 students except for students with disabilities Student-Teacher Ratio: Grade 6 ELA and Math, 30:1 and all other subjects, 35:1 Grades 7-8, 35:1	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.	\$48,725	36	\$2,227,428.57	\$2,969.90
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers' supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		3.5		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	FY09 InSite data documents that districts spent an average of \$328 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a cursory review of graduate programs at public colleges and universities, the following was found. At the College of Charleston, part-time graduates pay \$324 per credit hour. At Clemson, academic fees average \$365 per		39.5	\$13,825.00	\$18.43

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
	credit hour for part-time graduate students. An average of \$350 was used.				
Proviso 1A.31. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		39.5	\$10,862.50	\$14.48
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of inservice training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,725 a teacher is compensated at \$328 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,640.		39.5	\$64,780.00	\$86.37
Regulation 43-205 one principal with an enrollment of 250 students or more	1.0 Principal	\$88,489		\$113,265.92	\$151.02
Regulation 43-205 an assistant principal or curriculum coordinator in schools over 500 students	1.0 Assistant Principal	\$69,399		\$88,830.72	\$118.44
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,889		\$35,697.92	\$47.60
	1.0 Attendance Clerk/Bookkeeper	\$19,418		\$24,855.04	\$33.14
Section 59-59-100 requires one guidance counselor for every 300 students in middle school;	Guidance Counselors	\$55,097	2.5	\$176,310.40	\$235.08

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Schools having an enrollment of 750 or more must employ 2 full-time media specialists	2.0 Media Specialists	\$53,837		\$137,822.72	\$183.76
Section 5-7-12 and Section 59-66-20 School Resource Officers	Original allocation was \$20,500; however, program no longer has separate appropriation. Cost based on midpoint of salary range for a Law Enforcement Officer I which is a pay band of 4 (Source: Office of Human Resources, February 9, 2011)	\$35,457		\$45,384.96	\$60.51
Section 59-59-100 one career specialist in every middle school beginning with the 2006-07 school year.	1.0 Career Specialist (Based on salary that is being funded in FY10)	\$40,747		\$52,156.16	\$69.54
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools (\$25 per child)			\$18,750.00	\$25.00
Section 59-39-100 Requires 24 units for high school graduation	Prior to Fiscal Year 2009-10, a separate line item appropriation was included in the state budget to assist schools in meeting the 24 units for graduation. These funds were consolidated into one line item totaling \$21,956,313 and reallocated based on total WPU's in each district. The model would recommend allocating these funds			\$75,877.50	\$101.17

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
	between middle and high schools based on the 135-day ADM (217,029.70) to fund the extra 24 units, which equates to \$101.17.				
Section 59-18-310 statewide formative assessment program for students	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50 .			\$3,375.00	\$4.50
Proviso 2.7. 6-8 Lottery Enhancement Funds, Grades 6-8 Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies Program	Currently, lottery funds for 6-8 enhancement are allocated based on the sum of \$5 times the number of non-free and reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students and \$15 times the number of free/reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students. This model would allocate the \$2.0 million currently allocated for middle schools across 158,266 students in grades 6 - 8 per 2008-			\$9,480.00	\$12.64

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
	09 135-day ADM, resulting in a \$12.64 per pupil.				
Section 59-18-500 refer to summer school as part of a student's academic plan; Re Regulation 43-240;	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded with add-on weights. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are limited English proficient are also funded with add-on weights.				
Section 59-139-10 and Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 6-8; and Proviso 1A.38..					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 and Proviso 1A.37.					
Total for Middle School					\$4,131.60

Salary* - Teacher salaries based on 2010-11 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2009-10 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
<p>Regulation 43-205: Average student-teacher ratio not to exceed 28:1 with a district maintaining an average student-teacher ratio of 21:1 in reading and math in grades one through three.</p> <p>Maximum Student to Teacher Ratios by grade: Prekindergarten, 20:1 Grades K-3, 30:1 Grades 4-5 ELA and Math, 30:1 Grades 4-5 All other subjects, 35:1 Section 59-35-10 Requires full-day kindergarten unless parents exempt child</p>	<p>Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.</p>	<p>\$48,725</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>\$1,496,832.00</p>	<p>\$2,993.66</p>
<p>Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.</p>	<p>Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers' supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.</p>		<p>2</p>		

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	FY09 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$328 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a cursory review of graduate programs at public colleges and universities, the following was found. At the College of Charleston, part-time graduates pay \$324 per credit hour. At Clemson, academic fees average \$365 per credit hour for part-time graduate students. An average of \$350 was used.		26	\$9,100.00	\$18.20
Proviso 1A.31. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		26	\$7,150.00	\$14.30
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of in-service training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,725 a teacher is compensated at \$328 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,640.		26	\$42,640.00	\$85.28
Regulation 43-205 One principal for school with at least 375 students	1.0 Principal	\$83,448		\$106,813.44	\$213.63
Regulation 43-205 requires each school with an enrollment of 600 or more students to be staffed with at least one full-time assistant principal	Enrollment is less than 600; therefore, none is required.				
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,889		\$35,697.92	\$71.40
	1.0 Attendance clerk/bookkeeper	\$19,418		\$24,855.04	\$49.71

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 400 or more to employ a full-time media specialist	1.0 Library Media Specialist	\$53,837		\$68,911.36	\$137.82
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 501 or more to employ one full-time certified counselor.	1.0 Guidance Counselor	\$55,097		\$70,524.16	\$141.05
Section 59-10-210 Beginning school year 2007-08, one nurse in every elementary school	1.0 Nurse	\$38,949		\$49,854.72	\$99.71
Sections 59-10-10 and 59-10-20 of the Students Health and Fitness Act of 2005 and Proviso 1.63. require each student to have 50 minutes a week in PE in a class not to exceed 28 students per teacher; 59-10-20 requires one PE teacher for every 700 elementary students in FY07, one to 600 in FY08 and one to 500 in FY09. Section 59-210-40 requires professional development for PE teachers	1.0 PE Teacher	\$48,725		\$62,368.00	\$124.74
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools			\$12,500.00	\$25.00

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-1-525; Proviso 2.6 Education Lottery Appropriations: K-5 Enhancement Program	In FY10, each district received a base appropriation of \$60,000 plus \$75 per student. Additional allocations were made based on percentage of students in poverty and for coaches, \$20,000, out of lottery carryover funds. The 2009-10 135-day ADM for grades K-5 was estimated at 279,564.85 and lottery revenues allocation of \$47,614,527. Consequently, each student would receive an allocation of \$170.31.			\$85,155.00	\$170.31
Section 59-18-310 formative assessment for students	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50 .			\$2,250.00	\$4.50
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-267 Early Childhood Intervention (Act 135) applies to grades 1-3	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded with add-on weights. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are limited English proficient are also funded with add-on weights.				
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 4-5 and Proviso 1A.62.					
59-18-500 (B-D), Regulation 43-240 Summer Schools					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 & Proviso 1A.61. Gifted and talented program incorporates ratio of 1:20 for special school model and 1:15 for					

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
resource model					
Total for Elementary School					\$4,149.30

OTHER PRE-K Programs:

Chapter 139 of Title 59, Regulation 43-264 and Proviso 1A.12. Half-day program for four-year olds. Allocations based on the number of kindergarten children who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; however, no district receives less than 90 percent of the amount it received in the prior fiscal year.	In FY10, 18,494 four-year-olds were served in the half-day program at \$623.91 per child.				\$623.91
Proviso 1.62.. SC Child Development Education Pilot Program	In FY10, 4,656 served in public schools participating in CDEPP at \$4,093 per child.				\$4,093.00
Section 59-36-50 and Proviso 1.9 services for preschoolers with disabilities	1995 Joint Committee to Study Formula Funding in Education Programs recommended \$3,009 per student. In Fiscal Year 2009-10 14,956 preschool children with disabilities were funded. Total appropriation was \$2,878,146. The population served is 4.5% of the total state enrollment in elementary schools.			\$67,702.50	\$135.41

Salary* - Teacher salaries based on 2010-11 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2009-10 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

Classifications	2007-08 ADM	2008-09 ADM	2009-10 ADM	Current Weights	Revised Weights	2010 Revised WPU
Kindergarten	45,933.11	46,218.44	47,292.15	1.30	1.00	47,292.15
Primary (1-3)	140,128.19	141,214.98	139,877.96	1.24	1.00	139,877.96
Elementary (4-8)	226,433.69	228,752.17	230,986.84	1.00	1.00	230,986.84
High School (9-12)	75,744.02	77,032.81	78,437.64	1.25	1.00	78,437.64
Educable Mentally Handicapped	5,141.99	4,525.01	3,946.09	1.74		7,873.52
Learning Disabled	45,210.16	45,147.06	44,307.57	1.74		78,555.88
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	2,551.93	2,489.40	2,367.79	2.04		5,078.38
Emotionally Handicapped	3,886.19	3,622.95	3,166.00	2.04		7,390.82
Orthopedically Handicapped	957.55	947.13	881.22	2.04		1,932.15
Visually Handicapped	612.32	622.4	528.81	2.57		1,599.57
Hearing Handicapped	1,139.85	1,140.83	1,004.42	2.57		2,931.93
Speech Handicapped	31,148.55	30,336.53	29,481.08	1.90		57,639.41
Homebound	2,360.19	2,278.05	2,206.95	2.10	1.00	2,206.95
Autism	2,514.77	2,828.60	3,127.72	2.57		7,269.50
Vocational 1	64,128.39	65,809.02	62,918.35	1.29		
Vocational 2	24,506.42	24,790.50	23,970.59	1.29		
Vocational 3	13,274.13	13,683.01	13,511.15	1.29		
Career and Technology (Combine Vocational 1, 2 and 3)	101,908.94	104,282.53	100,400.09		1.20	120,480.11
Total General Education WPU						789,552.80
<u>Additional Classifications:</u>						
<i>Compensatory:</i>						
Poverty (K-12)	440,886.73	449,806.00	461,931.00		0.20	92,386.20
Non-English Speaking	28,000.00	31,275.00	32,275.00		0.20	6,455.00
Total Compensatory WPU						98,841.20
<i>Program:</i>						
Gifted and Talented (3-12)	102,164.00	114,077.00	111,438.00	0.30	0.15	16,715.70
Academic Assistance	105,936.00	103,193.00	130,446.00	0.114	0.15	19,566.90
Adult Education 17-21 Population	18,761.00	19,876.00	14,209.00		0.20	2,841.80
Total Program WPU						39,124.40
GRAND TOTAL WPU						927,518.40

* All counts are based upon the 2009-10 135-day actual ADM counts, as provided to the EOC by SCDE. All classifications and ADMs in bold are unduplicated counts.

Adult Education: The funds would target young people who are between the ages of 17 and 21 and have not obtained a high school diploma. The allocation would equal \$1,000 per student for a minimum of 300 hours of attendance or the successful completion of a high school credential during the school year. The data were provided by SCDE.

Academic Assistance: In 2010 there were 119,860 students in grades three through 8 who scored Not Met on the Reading, Mathematics or both sections of the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). It should be noted 24,985 of these students are full-pay lunch status. In addition there were another 10,586 students who did not pass the ELA, Mathematics or both sections of the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) on their first attempt in 2010. The total number of students not meeting state standards would be 130,446.

Poverty: The original EOC funding models had separate line items for prevention and remediation. Prevention was targeted to students in grades K-3 who were eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program and/or Medicaid. Remediation targeted students in grades 3-8 who had scored Below Basic on one or more sections of PACT. The 2006 EOC funding model allocated funds for all students in grades K-12 who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch and/or Medicaid. The poverty weighting recognizes the chronic impact of poverty. Data provided by SCDE showed that the poverty index in 2009-10 was 67.14 percent. The 135-day ADM for public schools in Fiscal Year 2009-10 was 688,012.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): A January 2009 report to the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs in Maine reviewed LEP Funding polices in the United States. Forty-four states fund LEP services through pupil weightings, flat grants or resource-based allocations. An August 2007 report by the Federation for American Immigration Reform documented that state expenditures for English language instruction programs in public schools ranged from \$290 per student in Idaho to \$711 per student in Tennessee. In Tennessee, the local share of the funding program is documented at an additional \$487 per enrollee. The total amount of state and local expenditures in Tennessee is approximately \$1,200 per student. Using the Tennessee model of \$1,200 per student, the revised LEP weight for SC would be 0.20. The state of North Carolina which funds LEP with state appropriations has created a Joint Select Committee on Public School Funding Formulas. SCDE documented that 32,275 students in SC had limited English proficiency in 2009-10.

Gifted and Talented (G&T): In FY 2009-10 there were 76,198 academically gifted and talented students served, 16,544 artistically gifted and talented students served, and another 28,720 students enrolled in at least one AP or IB class.