

SC COMMUNITY BLOCK GRANTS FOR EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM

FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018-19

**SC Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program**

For the fourth year, the South Carolina General Assembly has authorized and funded the SC Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program (Education Pilot Program) for Fiscal Year 2018-19. Specific grant requirements and mandates are included in Proviso 1.65, attached as Appendix A.

## Background

The Education Pilot Program’s purpose is **to improve children’s readiness for kindergarten by enhancing the quality of pre-kindergarten programs for four-year-old children.** It is a matching grants program intended to encourage and sustain community partnerships among schools, school districts and local communities. Successful partnerships will implement innovative, state-of-the-art initiatives and models to improve student learning. Successful proposals will be well-designed and provide a proven track record of improving student performance.

Substantial local leadership and support as well as educator understanding of challenges (supported by data) are integral to the success of local educational initiatives. The Education Pilot Program seeks purposeful, data driven, strategies that will improve children’s learning, development and readiness for kindergarten. Proviso 1.65 requires the establishment of a local Community Advisory Committee to guide and assist program leadership and staff throughout the grant cycle. An existing local advisory body with community members can serve as the Community Advisory Committee if it is able to fulfill the Committee’s responsibilities.

For the current fiscal year, funds allocated to this grants program must be used to provide or expand **high-quality** early childhood programs for a targeted population of at-risk four-year-olds. Any school district or school is eligible to apply. Proposal districts must meet **minimum program requirements for state-funded full-day 4K**as stated in Proviso 1.65.[[1]](#footnote-1) Applicant schools or school districts must offer a high-quality early childhood program that addresses **measurable high-quality child-teacher interactions, curricula and instruction**. Research shows that other characteristics include: highly skilled educators, small class sizes, an environment that is rich with language, books, print materials and conversation between and among children and adults. The most current Public School Guidelines for 4K and the Parent and Family Handbook may be accessed on the S.C. Department of Education website at: <https://ed.sc.gov/instruction/early-learning-and-literacy/cdep/>.

The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) recently published “The State of Preschool 2016.” With its 2016 publication, NIEER introduced a new set of benchmarks that raised standards and reflected a shift toward supports for practices more directly linked to the quality of children’s experiences in the classroom.[[2]](#footnote-2) The 2017 NIEER Yearbook may be access on the NIEER website at: <http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/State-of-Preschool-2017-Full-7-16-18.pdf>. The Education Pilot Program reflects this national transition by supporting practices that impact the quality of children’s classroom experiences.

## Available Funding Categories

Total funding available for the Education Pilot Program is $1 million. The Pilot Program is funded with one-time, non-recurring Education Improvement Act revenue.

**There are two funding categories and applicants should select only one category:**

1. **New Grants:** If a district has not received this Education Pilot Program grant in the past, it may apply for a new grant. A district may apply for funding to implement a project that is based on published research with evidence of positive outcomes on students, families, educators. Awardees are required to implement a teacher-child interaction measure in at least 25 (twenty five percent) of all 4K classrooms in the district.
2. **Recurring Grants:** If a district has received this Education Pilot Program grant in the past, the district will apply for a recurring grant. Awardees are required to implement a teacher-child interaction measure in at least 40% (forty percent) of all 4K classrooms in the district.

## Required and Optional Funding Areas

* **All applicants must address measurable high-quality child-teacher interactions.**
* **Eligible teacher-child interaction measures are:** Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT), Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – 3rd Edition (ECERS-3), Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) or Classroom Observation of Early Mathematics Environment and Teaching (COEMET).[[3]](#footnote-3) More information about specific teacher-child interaction measures may be accessed online at: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/complete_compendium_full.pdf> and in **Appendix B.**
* In addition to the implementation of a teacher-child observational measure, three optional funding areas are available for funding, **from which one can be chosen**:
  1. **Assist in making the transition to kindergarten.** The shift from preschool to kindergarten represents a significant shift for children and their parents or caregivers. Kindergarten is their introduction to a more formal K-12 environment and includes new surroundings, peers and expectations. Children who adjust quickly to kindergarten are more likely to enjoy school and experience academic and social gains.
  2. **Improve the early literacy, numeracy or social/emotional readiness of children.** The achievement gap begins very early in life. By four years of age, a low-income child has heard 30 million fewer words than his/her more affluent peer. Early oral interactions are critical to the development of early literacy skills for young children. Longitudinal studies have also shown that mastery of some math concepts at school entry is the strongest predictor of later academic achievement. A recent EOC analysis of PASS data for students who participated in 4K suggests the achievement gap for these students in math is not closing and may be increasing.
  3. **Engage families in improving their children’s readiness for kindergarten.** The family is the primary force in preparing children for school and life. Children benefit when all adults who care for them--families and educators--work together. Family members are truly engaged when they take the lead and make decisions about their children’s learning. Family engagement is strongly correlated to children’s readiness for school and their academic success in school.
* No grant may exceed $250,000 annually.
* Matching Funds: Successful proposals will provide at least 10% (ten percent) match, which may be cash or in-kind supports (such as equipment, services, supplies, staff time). Specific cost detail of the match with amounts must be included in the proposal. Districts that have experience with an eligible strategy may be included in a proposal and receive funding as a “mentor” district. Please refer to **Appendix E** Evaluation Block Grant Case Studies for a few examples of district partnerships and mentor districts.

Match requirements are the responsibility of the school district based on poverty level(s) of elementary schools for which most (at least 51%) of the 4K students are zoned to attend. See the Poverty Level Sliding Scale Below.

In-kind match is the current cash value of any real property, equipment, goods, or services contributed to a SC Community Block Grant for Education project that would have been an eligible cost under the SC Community Block Grant for Education project if the recipient/sub-recipient was required to pay for such costs with SC Community Block Grant for Education project grant funds. “In-kind” needs to be priced at a stated rate for labor/time, what items are allowed to be counted toward in-kind, and a detailed breakout of actual items being counted toward in-kind. **An estimated cash value for in-kind that does not provide detail is not sufficient.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| If the school(s) that 4K students are zoned to attend have an average poverty index of: | Then, the district needs to provide a match of: |
| 89-100% | 10% |
| 77-88% | 15% |
| 63-76% | 20% |
| Less than 62% | At least 21% |

* Poverty rates should be based on the 2016-17 Poverty Index.

## Priority Points

Public school districts or schools that have a poverty index above 80 percent will receive 10 (ten) priority points, and public school districts or schools that have a low student achievement will receive 10 (ten) priority points if all other grant requirements are met.

**Poverty rates** will be based on the 2016-17 Poverty Index and may be accessed at: <https://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/historic-school-report-cards/2017/data-files-for-researchers-2017/>.

**Student achievement** is based on the academic achievement of third grade students in schools where at least 51% (percent) of 4K students are zoned to attend third grade. If the proposed project includes more than one school, provide the school name and achievement data for each. Schools with low student achievement are based on the state average of third grade students who scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the 2017-18 SC READY test in English language arts (ELA) or math. Statewide, in 2016, 23.2 percent of third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the ELA portion of SC READY. In mathematics, 21.5 percent of third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” in math. “Did Not Meet Expectations” suggests that students need substantial academic support to be prepared for the next grade level.

* + In English language arts, if 23.2 percent or more of the school’s third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the 2017-18 administration of SC READY ELA, then the school is considered low achieving **OR**
  + In math, if 21.5 percent or more of the school’s third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the 2017-18 administration of the SC READY mathematics, then the school is considered low achieving.

For more information on 2017-18 SC READY assessment scores, go to: <https://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/historic-school-report-cards/2017/data-files-for-researchers-2017/>.

## Selection Process and Timeline

* A seven-member independent grants committee will oversee the application procedure and selection process. Grants Committee members represent the education and business communities.
* An “intent to apply” is due by **12 noon on September 28, 2018.** The “intent to apply” can be emailed to Bunnie Lempesis Ward at [bward@eoc.sc.gov.](mailto:bward@eoc.sc.gov) Please include the name of potential applicant district(s) and primary staff contact information, including name, title, district, work number and email address. **The intent to apply is non-binding and is used to establish communications for subsequent RFP announcements. Districts are encouraged to submit an “intent to apply” if they are interested in the grant.**
* Informational conference call instructions will be emailed to primary staff contacts included in the “intent to apply.” The EOC must receive proposals by **12 noon on November 7, 2018.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and Time** | **Applicants** |
| **September 18, 2018** | Grant Application Released. |
| **September 28, 2018 by 12:00 p.m.** | Deadline for interested applicants to email an “intent to apply.” |
| **October 1-4, 2018** | Recurring grantee districts will participate in informational calls regarding project progress. |
| **October 5, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.** | EOC will conduct an informational conference call. |
| **November 7, 2018 by 12:00 p.m.** | Grant proposals are due to the EOC office. |
| **January 17, 2018, in Columbia, S.C.** | Selected applicants interviewed by Grants Committee. Each applicant selected for an interview will be notified of a specific interview time. |
| **January 23, 2019** | Successful applicants are notified. EOC develops press release. |
| **February 2019** | EOC Allocation of grant funds to grantees. |
| **Spring 2019** | Grants Orientation Meeting |

## Proposal Selection

Proposals will be reviewed and awarded up to a total of 125 points as outlined below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **New** | **Recurring** |
| Needs Assessment | 8 | 0 |
| Project Design | 7 | 7 |
| Teacher-Student Interaction Measure | 20 | 20 |
| Proposed Project Focus Area | 20 | 20 |
| Project Leadership/Staff | 15 | 10 |
| Project Implementation | 10 | 5 |
| Risk and Risk Mitigation strategies | 15 | 15 |
| Budget | 10 | 13 |
| Data on Project to Date | 0 | 15 |
| BONUS POINTS (Per Proviso 1.65) |  |  |
| Poverty Index of 80 percent or greater | 10 | 10 |
| Low Achievement School(s) | 10 | 10 |
| **TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS** | **125** | **125** |

## Proposal Requirements

* **These funds may not be used to supplant, or replace, funds currently allocated or used for quality enhancement.**
* **The lead applicant must be a school or school district.**
* Quarterly (every three months) grantee reports will be required and must include data and narrative about awarded projects’ programmatic progress and financial status. A template will be provided at a later time.
* All grant proposals must be in in a Word or PDF document with 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and sides with all pages numbered. Font should be Arial, Times New Roman or Calibri and no smaller than 11- point font. Footnotes should be no smaller than 10-point font.
* Submitted proposals must be formatted as portrait. Exceptions are: (a) logic model (b) budget templates.
* The proposal must not exceed 30 pages. The 30-page limit does not include (a) letters of support, (b) budget, (c) footnotes or endnotes, (d) cover page and (e) cover sheet. **Proposals over 30 pages will not be considered.**
* Proposal may use either footnotes or endnotes. Use either MLA (Modern Language Association), APA (American Psychological Association) or Chicago Manual of Style for formatting citations.
* Proposal must label each section of proposal as shown in application.
* Submit ten three-hole punched, double-sided copies of proposal. Use a staple, paper clip or binder clip each copy; do not package in permanent binders, folders, etc.
* Grant proposals must be mailed or delivered to the SC Education Oversight Committee Office. The mailing address is P.O. Box 11867 Columbia, SC 29201. All proposals must be received by the SC Education Oversight Committee Office by **November 7, 2018 at 12 p.m.** The address for the EOC is **502 Brown Building, Columbia, SC 29201.** The EOC is located on the grounds of the State House in the Brown Building, on the corner of Pendleton and Sumter Streets.
* Evaluation requirements: Awarded applicants will participate in an ongoing evaluation process managed by the EOC. Grantees will be expected to participate in site visits and data collection. Grantees may be asked to participate in project presentations. For evaluation purposes, grantees should be prepared to answer the following questions on outcomes and implementation.
  + Is the target population experiencing the changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviors or awareness that your program sought?
  + What are the project’s results (outputs and outcomes)?
  + What is the project accomplishing among your target population? How is the project:
    - performing the services or activities planned?
    - reaching the intended target population?
    - reaching the intended number of participants?
    - leading to expected outcomes?
  + How do participants perceive these services and activities?
* Questions or comments may be directed to:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Bunnie Ward | Hope Johnson-Jones |
| Director, Policy Development & Evaluation | Administrative Coordinator |
| [bward@eoc.sc.gov](mailto:bward@eoc.sc.gov) | [hjones@eoc.sc.gov](mailto:hjones@eoc.sc.gov) |
| (803) 734-2803 | (803) 734-6148 |

**Useful Definitions**

* **Community**: a group of parents, educators, and individuals from business, faith groups, elected officials, nonprofit organizations and others who support the public school district or school in its efforts to provide an outstanding education for each child. As applied to the schools impacted within a district or an individual school**,** “community” includes the school faculty and the School Improvement Council as established in Section 59-20- 60 of the 1976 Code.
* **Community Advisory Committee**: As required by Proviso 1.78, the Community Advisory Committee will provide guidance to program leadership and staff to leverage funding, identify and secure additional funding and resources. The Committee is actively engaged throughout the grant.
* **Poverty:** Poverty rates will be based on the 2017 Poverty Index and may be accessed at:

[https://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/historic-school-report-cards/2017/data-files-for-researchers-2017/.](%20https://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/historic-school-report-cards/2017/data-files-for-researchers-2017/.)

* **Student Achievement:** based on the academic achievement of third grade students in schools where at least 51% (percent) of 4K students are zoned to attend third grade. If the project includes more than one school, provide the school name and achievement data for each. Low student achievement schools are based on the state average of students who “Did Not Meet Expectations” 2017-18 SC READY English language arts or math scores of third grade students.
  + In English language arts, if 23.5% or more of the school’s third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the 2017-18 administration of SC READY English language arts, then the school is considered low achieving or
  + In math, if 21.5% or more of the school’s third graders scored “Did Not Meet Expectations” on the 2017-18 administration of the SC READY mathematics, then the school is considered low achieving.

For more information on 2017-18 SC READY assessment scores, go to: <https://ed.sc.gov/data/test-scores/state-assessments/sc-ready/2018/>.

* **High Quality Early Childhood Program:** meets the minimum program requirements of the state-funded full-day 4K program and provides measurable high-quality child-teacher interactions, curricula and instruction.
* **High-Quality Adult-Child Interactions:** effective, engaging interactions and environments that include a well- organized and managed classroom, social and emotional support, and instructional interactions and materials that stimulate young children’s thinking and skills. Such interactions involve the back-and-forth exchanges among teachers and children that occur throughout the day.

Measures of the quality of adult-child interactions should be obtained through a valid and reliable process for observing how teachers and caregivers interact with children. The process should be designed to promote child learning and to identify strengths and areas for improvement for early learning professionals. **See Appendix B for a list of recommended measures of high-quality adult-child interactions.**

For **Attachment 5** (Logic Model):

* **Logic Model:** A visual tool to clarify and depict a program’s goals, strategies and outcomes. A logic model can be used for program planning, program management, communication, and consensus building.
* **Problem/Issue:** Clear articulation of the problem or challenge that the program or initiative will address.
* **Goal**: Overall purpose or long-term outcome of the program.
* **Research/Evidence:** Description of relevant published research, evidence or best practices that describe how change occurs.
* **Activities/Intervention:** Actions that are needed to implement proposed program. Describes how program resources will be used in order to achieve program outcomes and goals. Also considered to be processes, strategies, methods or action steps.
* **Outputs:** Measurable, tangible, and direct products or results of program activities. They lead to desired outcomes but are not themselves the changes expected due to the program. Outputs help assess how well the program is being implemented. Outputs frequently include quantities to reflect the size or scope of services or instruction being delivered.
* **Outcomes:** Results the program intends to achieve if implemented as planned. Outcomes are the changes that occur or the difference that is made for the population during or after the program. Outcomes should be within the scope of the program’s control or sphere of reasonable influence, as well as the timeframe that has been chosen for the logic model. They should be generally accepted as valid by stakeholders, framed in terms of change and measurable.
* **Measures/Assessment Tools:** Name or description of any specific measures or assessments that will provide information about the impact of the project’s implemented strategies or activities.

**FY 2018-19 SC Community Block Grant**

**Grant Application**

## Proposal Summary and Contact Information

* 1. Complete **Cover Page** (**Attachment 1.1)** and
  2. Coversheet **(Attachment 1.2).** Please place Cover Page and Coversheet as first two pages of your proposal.

1. **Project Description: Narrative and Logic Model**

2.1 The Project Description includes the Narrative and Logic Model. The Narrative and Logic Model should align. The Narrative provides detail, and the Logic Model summarizes the proposed project with quantifiable and measurable outputs and outcomes. **Focus the Project Description on outcomes – measurable goals the proposed project will achieve.**

* 1. Provide details on anticipated outcomes and address the following:
     1. Identify the projected outcome.
     2. Describe the focus and content of any strategies that will result in projected outcome.
        1. Example: if proposing professional development strategies, what are focus and content of professional development?
        2. When and how will professional development be provided?
        3. Estimate total hours of professional development that will be provided.
        4. Who are the target participants for professional development? Quantify the estimated number of participants.

1. **Teacher-Student Interaction Measure**
   1. Detail the proposed teacher-student interaction measure, including the rationale for selecting the measure, level of fidelity, and ways fidelity will be tracked. Eligible teacher-child interaction measures are**:**
      * Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT)
      * Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
      * Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – 3rd Edition (ECERS-3)
      * Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)
      * Classroom Observation of Early Mathematics Environment and Teaching (COEMET)
   2. Document the total number of 4K classrooms, and the total percent of 4K classrooms that will be impacted by the implementation of the teacher-student interaction measure. **Note: Must be at least 40 percent of all 4K classrooms included in the proposal.**
   3. Discuss the expected measurable improvements of the chosen interaction measure. Refer to Appendix B for a list of eligible teacher-student interaction measures.
   4. Explain selection process for classroom teachers chosen for teacher-student interaction.
   5. Discuss the expected measurable improvements of the chosen interaction measure.
   6. Discuss teacher preparation, support and teacher professional development. Professional evaluation

cannot be based on the percentage of teachers who participate, frequency, self-reports or their use of what they learned in professional development. Provide details on anticipated measurable outcomes and address the following:

* + 1. Identify the projected outcome for professional development.
    2. Describe the focus and content of proposed professional development.
    3. When and how will professional development be provided?
    4. Estimate total hours of professional development that will be provided.
    5. Who are the target participants for professional development? Quantify the estimated number of participants.
    6. Evaluate the impact of project professional development on (a) teachers' practice and (b) improvements in children's behavior/performance resulting from their teachers' improved practice.

1. **Focus Area of Project**

Describe focus area of your project chosen from the three choices below (a-c). Provide published research that the priority is based on best practices and available data. Include anticipated outcomes for project focus area.

**4.1 Assisting in making the transition to kindergarten.** The shift from preschool to kindergarten represents a significant shift for children and their parents or caregivers. Kindergarten is their introduction to a more formal K-12 environment and includes new surroundings, peers and expectations. Children who adjust quickly to kindergarten are more likely to enjoy school and experience academic and social gains.

* 1. **Improving the early literacy, numeracy or social/emotional readiness of children.** The achievement gap begins very early in life. By four years of age, a low-income child has heard 30 million fewer words than his/her more affluent peer. Early oral interactions are critical to the development of early literacy skills for young children. Longitudinal studies have also shown that mastery of some math concepts at school entry is the strongest predictor of later academic achievement. A recent EOC analysis of PASS data for students who participated in 4K suggests the achievement gap for these students in math is not closing and may be increasing.
  2. **Engaging families in improving their children’s readiness for kindergarten.** The family is the primary force in preparing children for school and life. Children benefit when all adults who care for them--families and educators--work together. Family members are truly engaged when they take the lead and make decisions about their children’s learning. Family engagement is strongly correlated to children’s readiness for school and their academic success in school.

1. **Logic Model**

Complete **Attachment 5 (Logic Model)**. The Logic Model should represent a summary of the proposal narrative and quantify measurable outputs and outcomes. A sample logic model is included but remove the sample from your final proposal submission. Terms used in the Logic Model are defined in the “Useful Definitions” section.

1. **Outcome Data on Project to Date (FOR RECURRING GRANT PROPOSALS ONLY):**

Focusing on project outcomes, provide numerical and descriptive data on the project currently or

previously funded by the Community Block Grant, including data for at least two points during the project year. Describe data variances from plan versus actual that may be attributed to the implementation of this project. Explain results and significance of data. Report project outcomes. Show actual vs planned budget expenses and explain any significant differences. If another Community Block grant is funded, forecast how project outcomes will change. This should be a data driven versus qualitative discussion.

1. **Needs Assessment**

Describe the need or challenge the project will address. Discuss relevant data that provides evidence of the need or challenge, such as the target population to be served (children, families, educators). **Document baseline data that is relevant to the goals of the grant.** If proposal is a recurring project that was funded previously by the Community Block Grant, only provide needs assessment information if there is a significant change in the needs since your original awarded project.

1. **Project Design**
   1. Provide a review of the research on which the initiative is based, giving full Chicago Manual of Style, MLA or APA citation for all research. State the goal of the project. All goals need specific numeric targets. Outline the strategies and activities to be undertaken. Detail the project’s use of practices and models that are supported by evidence. Explain, how this project will change or enhance current work with four-year-olds; ideally, using measurable changes or enhancements.
   2. Indicate if you have applied for a similar grant and detail the scope, measures and outcomes, and budget.
   3. **Complete Attachment 8.3 (Project Partners).** Explain how partners will help accomplish the project’s goals. Letters of support should only be from listed partners.
   4. Describe, when possible with measurable examples, how the project will help prepare students to be college and career ready. Show how preparation links to the Profile of the SC Graduate in **Appendix C.**
2. **Project Implementation**
   1. Milestones and Timeline:Provide a timeline and other relevant information, such as planned technical assistance or professional development. Provide an outline of measurable milestones for the proposed project and an action plan to address challenges if the milestone is not met.
   2. Risk and Risk Mitigation Strategies:Discuss possible risks or challenges that may impact the success of the proposed project and achievement of outcomes. Provide detail about plans to address risks or challenges. Limit your list of risks to no more than the five you perceive as most significant.
3. **Project Leadership/Staff**

Describe and provide an organizational chart illustrating the management structure of the program and how it fits within the school/district. Be specific. Must include:

* 1. What each listed key individual will be accountable for.
  2. Persons, positions or areas that will report to each key individual.
  3. Percent of time each of the key people overseeing the grant will devote to the project.
  4. Brief biographies of key personnel that must include details regarding their related experience and/or projects.

1. **Budget**

**11.1 Itemized Budget**: Using Attachment 11.1, provide an itemized budget for each strategy for two time periods: April 2019-June 2020 and July 2020-June 2021. The itemized budget should be aligned with each strategy provided in Attachment 2.2 (Logic Model). Each strategy needs a self-contained/stand-alone budget. Any strategy or goal of the proposal that does not have a detailed budget will be considered incomplete. If proposal is for a recurring grant, provide prior approved project actual expenses and planned expenses so any variance will be clearly detailed. Budgets provided for both time periods should include cash and in-kind match amounts that are consistent with total amounts indicated in **Attachment 8.3 (Project Partners).**

**11.2 Budget Narrative**: Provide budget narrative that provides additional detail aligned with **Attachment 11.1 (Itemized Budgets).** Organize the budget narrative using each of the budget categories below. Provide evidence of the ability to meet the grant match for each time period.

11.2.1 Salaries and Benefits**:** List each position that will be compensated with grant funds. Include the annual salary or hourly rate with total compensation amount by position. If a portion of benefits will also be included in this grant, detail the amount and percentage of benefits that will be allocated to the grant.

11.2.2 Purchased Services:Provide specific information about any costs associated with travel, professional development, consultants, evaluation.

11.2.3 Supplies:Detail any supplies requested, including assessments, curricula, student or family materials.

11.2.4 Equipment or Information Technology Needs**:** Detail any expenses associated with the purchase of equipment or information technology.

11.2.5 Other Costs:Specify any other project-related costs, such as transportation.

11.2.6 Use of Other Funds:Provide details about the use of financial resources provided as part of the grant match or by collaborating partners. Information in this section should be consistent with information provided in **Attachment 8.3 (Project Partners).**

**Grant Lead School/District Applicant Name:**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Project Name:**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Type of Grant Request:**

* **New**
* **Recurring**

**Grant Amount Requested: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**1.1: Proposal Coversheet for FY 2018-19 Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate if request is New or Recurring:** | | | |
| **PROJECT CONTACTS** | | | |
| **Lead School/District Applicant**  **Name:** |  | Address: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Contact Phone: |  | Contact E-Mail: |  |
| **Name of Fiscal Agent for Grant:** |  | Address: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Contact Phone: |  | Contact E-Mail: |  |
| **PROJECT LOCATIONS: If there are more than three project sites, provide information on additional sheet.** | | | |
| **Project Site 1:** |  | Address: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Contact Phone: |  | Contact E-Mail: |  |
| Number Served: |  | 2017 Poverty Index for Site: |  |
| Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on 2017 SC  READY in ELA |  | Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on  2017 SC READY in Math |  |
| **Project Site 2:** |  | Address: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Contact Phone: |  | Contact E-Mail: |  |
| Number Served: |  | 2017 Poverty Index for Site: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on 2017 SC  READY in ELA |  | Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on  2017 SC READY in Math |  |
| **Project Site 3:** |  | Address: |  |
| Contact Name: |  | Contact Title: |  |
| Contact Phone: |  | Contact E-Mail: |  |
| Number Served: |  | 2017 Poverty Index for Site: |  |
| Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on 2017 SC  READY in ELA |  | Percent of 3rd Graders who scored “Does Not Meet” on  2017 SC READY in Math |  |
| **PROPOSED BUDGET and PROJECT SUMMARY** | | | |
| **Total Grant Amount Requested:** |  | **Grant Cash Match Provided:** |  |
| **Total Percent of Grant Match**  **Provided:** |  | **Value of In-Kind Match Provided:** |  |
| **One Sentence Description of Proposed Project**:  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | |

## Attachment 5: Logic Model Template and Sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Problem/Issue |  | | | |
| Goal |  | | | |
| Research/Evidence | Strategies/Intervention | Outputs  (include measurable numbers) | Outcomes (1-2 years)  (include measurable numbers) | Measures and Assessment Tools |
|  | Strategy 1: |  |  |  |
|  | Strategy 2: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Sample Logic Model – Please do not include sample in proposal.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Problem/Issue | Kindergarten readiness is one of the first indicators of preparedness for academic success. In ABC Elementary, one of our highest poverty schools, there has been a 20% increase in the number of 4K students demonstrating behavioral difficulties. Behavioral issues impact student’s readiness for kindergarten. This challenge is validated further by the 4K language and literacy assessment data. Only 60% were proficient in letter recognition, 8% in vocabulary and 53% in phonological awareness. | | | |
| Goal | At four elementary schools that offer 4K, students’ kindergarten readiness will improve by Teachers’ ability to support the social-  emotional needs of their 4K students and the management of their classrooms will improve. | | | |
| Research/Evidence | Strategy/Intervention | Outputs | Project Outcomes (1-2 years) | Outcome Measures and  Assessment Tools |
| There is growing consensus among researchers and practitioners that children's social-emotional readiness makes unique contributions to their successful transition to and progress through school. However, many children still begin school ill-prepared for the behavioral demands they will encounter in the classroom. | Strategy 1: To support students’ social-emotional development, enhance educator responsiveness to students’ needs. Implement TPOT classroom observation tool. | All 12 4K teachers and 12 4K Teachers Assistants at four schools will participate in a two-day training on social-emotional development. At least 3 district staff and teacher mentors will be trained in TPOT. Beginning in the 2019-20 school year, TPOT-trained staff will support teachers and teacher assistants with self-reflection and technical assistance based upon at least three classroom observations during the school year. | On average, quality of teacher-child interactions will improve by at least 15% after three classroom observations and subsequent technical assistance.  Measured by number of teacher calls to guardians and parents and the number of teacher referrals to principal, 4K student behavioral issues will improve by 10% during the 2019-20 school year. | TPOT classroom observation scores for teachers and teacher assistants.  Data regarding number of student referral to principal and number of teacher calls to guardians and parents for challenging behavior. |
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**Attachment 8.3: Project Partners**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner** | **Type of Organization**  (public, private, nonprofit) | **Mission of Organization** | **Role in Proposed**  **Project** | **Type of**  **Contribution**  (cash, in-kind, other) | **Value of Contribution in Dollars** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL VALUE**[[[4]](#footnote-4)](#_bookmark2) | | | |  |  |

**FY 2018-19 SC Community Block Grant**

**Attachment 11.1: Budget Detail for April 2019-June 2020 and July 2020-June 2021**

|  | All Grant Proposals: Complete Columns A-E | | | | | Recurring Education Pilot Program Grant Proposals:  Also Complete Columns F-H | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy 1: Teacher-Student Interaction Measure (Identify Measure)** | **(A) Education Pilot Program Grant Request Amount** | **(B) Proposer Cash Match Funds** | **(C) Proposer In-Kind Match Funds** | **(D) Project Subtotal** | **(E) Percent of Total Project Cost** | (F) Prior Education Pilot Program Amount Awarded | (G) Prior Education Pilot Program Amount Expended | (H) Variance between Column (6) & Column (7) |
| Salaries | | | | | | | | |
| Project Staff 1: (Name or Position) | $0 |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Project Staff 2: (Name or Position) |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Project Staff 3: (Name or Position) |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Salaries Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **100.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Benefits | | | | | | | | |
| Benefits for Project Staff 1: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Benefits for Project Staff 2: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  |  |
| Benefits for Project Staff 3: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  |  |
| **Benefits Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Purchased Services | | | | | | | | |
| Purchased Service 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Purchased Service 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Purchased Service 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Purchased Services Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | |
| Supply Item 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Supply Item 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Supply Item 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Supplies Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | |
| Equipment Item 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Equipment Item 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Equipment Item 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Equipment Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Other Expenses | | | | | | | | |
| Expense 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Expense 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Expense 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Other Expenses Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Strategy 1 Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **100.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Strategy 2: Project Focus** | **Education Pilot Program Grant Request Amount** | **Proposer Cash Match Funds** | **Proposer In-Kind Match Funds** | **Project Subtotal** | **Percent of Total Project Cost** | (F) Prior Education Pilot Program Amount Awarded | (G) Prior Education Pilot Program Amount Expended | (H) Variance between Column (6) & Column (7) |
| Salaries | | | | | | | | |
| Project Staff 1: (Name or Position) |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Project Staff 2: (Name or Position) |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Project Staff 3: (Name or Position) |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Salaries Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Benefits | | | | | | | | |
| Benefits for Project Staff 1: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Benefits for Project Staff 2: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Benefits for Project Staff 3: |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Benefits Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Purchased Services | | | | | | | | |
| Purchased Service 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Purchased Service 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Purchased Service 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Purchased Services Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Supplies | | | | | | | | |
| Supply Item 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Supply Item 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Supply Item 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Supplies Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | |
| Equipment Item 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Equipment Item 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Equipment Item 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Equipment Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Other Expenses | | | | | | | | |
| Expense 1: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Expense 2: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| Expense 3: Specify |  |  |  | $0 |  |  |  | $0 |
| **Other Expenses Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Strategy 2 Total** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **0.0%** | $0 | $0 | $0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Grand Total** | **$4** | **$0** | **$0** | **$4** |  | **$0** | **$0** | **$0** |

**NOTE:** **Attachment 11.1: Budget Detail for both time periods (1) April 2019-June 2020 and (2) July 2020-June 2021 should be formatted the same. Template also available in Excel. Please contact Bunnie Lempesis Ward at** [**bward@eoc.sc.gov**](mailto:bward@eoc.sc.gov)**.**
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**Resource Guide**

**Appendix A**

**Proviso 1.65: SC Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program**

There is created the South Carolina Community Block Grants for Education Pilot Program. The purpose of this matching grants program is to encourage and sustain partnerships between a community and its local public school district or school for the implementation of innovative, state-of-the-art education initiatives and models to improve student learning. The initiatives and models funded by the grant must be well designed, based on strong evidence of effectiveness, and have a history of improved student performance.

The General Assembly finds that the success offered by these initiatives and programs is assured best when vigorous community support is integral to their development and implementation. It is the intent of this proviso to encourage public school and district communities and their entrepreneurial public educators to undertake state-of-the-art initiatives to improve student learning and to share the results of these efforts with the state’s public education community.

As used in this proviso:

1. Community is defined as a group of parents, educators, and individuals from business, faith groups, elected officials, nonprofit organizations and others who support the public school district or school in its efforts to provide an outstanding education for each child. As applied to the schools impacted within a district or an individual school, community includes the school faculty and the School Improvement Council as established in Section 59-20-60 of the 1976 Code;
2. Poverty is defined as the percent of students eligible in the prior year for the free and reduced-price lunch program and or Medicaid; and
3. Achievement is as established by the Education Oversight Committee for the report card ratings developed pursuant to Section 59-18-900 of the 1976 Code.

The Executive Director of the Education Oversight Committee is directed to appoint an independent grants committee to develop the process for awarding the grants including the application procedure, selection process, and matching grant formula. The grants committee will be comprised of seven members, three members selected from the education community and four members from the business community. The chairman of the committee will be selected by the committee members at the first meeting of the grants committee. The grants committee will review and select the recipients of the Community Block Grants for Education.

The criteria for awarding the grants must include, but are not limited to:

1. the establishment and continuation of a robust community advisory committee to leverage funding, expertise, and other resources to assist the district or school throughout the implementation of the initiatives funded through the Block Grant Program;
2. a demonstrated ability to meet the match throughout the granting period;
3. a demonstrated ability to implement the initiative or model as set forth in the application; and
4. an explanation of the manner in which the initiative supports the districts or schools strategic plan required by Section 59-18-1310 of the 1976 Code.

In addition, the district or school, with input from the community advisory committee, must include:

1. a comprehensive plan to examine delivery implementation and measure impact of the model;
2. a report on implementation problems and successes and impact of the innovation or model; and
3. evidence of support for the project from the school district administration when an individual school applies for a grant.

The match required from a grant recipient is based on the poverty of the district or school. No matching amount will exceed more than seventy percent of the grant request or be less than ten percent of the request. The required match may be met by funds or by in-kind donations, such as technology, to be further defined by the grants committee. Public school districts and schools that have high poverty and low achievement will receive priority for grants when their applications are judged to meet the criteria established for the grant program.

However, no grant may exceed $250,000 annually unless the grants committee finds that exceptional circumstances warrant exceeding this amount.

The Education Oversight Committee will review the grantee reports and examine the implementation of the initiatives and models to understand the delivery of services and any contextual factors. The Oversight Committee will then highlight the accomplishments and common challenges of the initiatives and models funded by the Community Block Grant for Education Pilot Program to share the lessons learned with the state’s public education community.

### For the current fiscal year, funds allocated to the Community Block Grant for Education Pilot Program must be used to provide or expand high-quality early childhood programs for a targeted population of at-risk four-year-olds. High-quality is defined as meeting the minimum program requirements of the Child Early Reading Development and Education Program and providing measurable high-quality child-teacher interactions, curricula and instruction. Priority will be given to applications that involve public-private partnerships between school districts, schools, Head Start, and private child care providers who collaborate to: (1) provide high- quality programs to four-year-olds to maximize the return on investment; (2) assist in making the transition to kindergarten; (3) improve the early literacy, social and emotional, and numeracy readiness of children; and (4) engage families in improving their children’s readiness.

## Appendix B

**Comparison of Assessments that Measure Quality of Teacher-Child Interactions[[5]](#footnote-5)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment/ Measure** | **Ages Served and Learning Environment** | **Primary Purpose and Administration** | **Reliability and Validity** |
| Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) | Two versions are available: pre- school classroom and a K-3 classroom | * Program Improvement/ Evaluation * Observer must attend a training session and pass a reliability test. * Cost is $600 per person for training and $20 for manual * 2 hours to administer | * Not normed. Reliability: High (.80 or higher). Concurrent validity: Low (below .50). Significant correlations were found with other measures of classroom quality, but they were generally low, possible because this tool measures different aspects of the classroom than other quality measures. * Average inter-rater reliability reported in the Technical Appendix is 87%. Stability across time is uniformly high with almost all correlations above .90. * Results from NCEDL multi-state study show classroom quality as assessed by CLASS is associated with children’s performance at the end of pre-school as well as gains in in   their performance across the preschool year. |
| Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale 3rd Edition  (ECERS-3) | Early childhood classrooms serving 2.5-5 year olds. New version published in late  2014. | Program Improvement, Monitoring/Accreditation, Research/Evaluation | Basic field test for reliability. Ongoing testing of reliability and validity, using Item Response Theory. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment/ Measure** | **Ages Served and Learning Environment** | **Primary Purpose and Administration** | **Reliability and Validity** |
| Early Language & Literacy Classroom Observation Tool (ELLCO Pre-K) | Center-based classrooms for 3- to 5- year-old children | * Program Improvement, Research/Evaluation * Can be administered by teachers, principals, administrators, supervisors, program directors, or researchers * Cost is $50 * 60-90 minutes to administer | The ELLCO Research Edition was used for research purposes in more than 150 preschool classrooms; the reliability was 90% or better. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment/ Measure** | **Ages Served and Learning Environment** | **Primary Purpose and Administration** | **Reliability and Validity** |
| Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool  (TPOT) | Pre-school classrooms | Research/Evaluation | * Three separate studies with 174 classrooms. Inter-rater score reliability coefficients were generally acceptable for key practice items. Means percentage scores demonstrated adequate stability. Noteworthy relationships between scores for 10 of 14 TPOT key practice items and overall global classroom quality scores on ECERS-R. TPOT Red Flags subscale had substantial negative relationships with scores for all CLASS domain and dimension scores. |
| Classroom Observation of Early Mathematics Environment and Teaching (COEMET) | Pre-school classrooms but COEMET creators support use of tool in learning environments for toddlers through 2nd grade students. | * The purpose of this measure is to assess the quality and quantity of mathematics instruction in early education settings. * Aims to determine teaching strategies, math content, clarity and correctness of mathematics teaching, and quality of student/teacher interaction (Kilday & Kinsey, 2009). | * Inter-rater Reliability "Interrater reliability for the COEMET, computed via simultaneous classroom visits by pairs of observers (10% of all observations, with pair memberships rotated), is 88%; 99% of the disagreements were the same polarity (i.e., if one was agree, the other was strongly agree)" (Clements & Sarama, 2008, p. 461). * Internal Consistency Coefficient alpha (inter-item correlations) for the two instruments ranged from .95 to .97 in previous research. Rasch model reliability is .96 for the COEMET. * Predictive Validity: Studies show the COEMET is a good predictor (e.g., r = .50) of child gain in measured mathematics achievement. Further, the COEMET is a partial mediator of the effects of mathematics interventions (Clements & Sarama, 2008). * Construct Validity: The COEMET was created based on a body of research on the characteristics and teaching strategies of effective teachers of early childhood mathematics. Each item is connected to one or more of these studies; thus, there is intended overlap between the instruments, with each specialized for its purpose. |
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**APPENDIX D**

**Education Pilot Program Awarded Projects for FY 2015-2018**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount**  **Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2015-16 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Cherokee** | $250,000 | Improve the early language and literacy readiness with a focus on vocabulary development for all 4K students in Cherokee County. Provide additional language and literacy support for 40 students at the four highest poverty elementary schools using the Language Environment Analysis (LENA) program. LENA uses a combination of parent and group trainings, personalized home visits, and individualized LENA feedback from an electronic device that serve as a "talk pedometer" to record and analyze words and conversational returns in the home setting. | CLASS |
| **Chesterfield** | $250,000 | Provide additional opportunities for at-risk four-year-olds by providing an additional 4K classroom each at Cheraw and Petersburg primary schools. Foster language and literacy experiences through read alouds. Provide take home books for 4K students at the two primary schools. Partner with Head Start and provide take home books for Head Start families and professional development for Head Start staff. | ELLCO |
| **Clarendon 2** | $249,086 | Modeled after the Fast Start approach and its early learning strategies, Families Reading Every Day (FRED) will provide books and learning tools that students take home weekly to use with their parents to reinforce classroom learning. Targeted concepts include: numeracy, looking at words and letters, playing with sounds and beginning to read. Parents will log how many minutes are spent on activities and reading, with a goal of ten minutes each weekday. | ELLCO |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount**  **Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2015-16 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Florence 1** | $250,000 | Increase the quantity and quality of teacher-child interactions, improve early literacy and numeracy instruction in 4K and engage families to assist their children in activities that improve school readiness. District will implement the Montessori curriculum to improve students' math skills and the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool to enhance the relationship between teachers and their students. TPOT promotes the social-emotional confidence of young children by training adults on effective ways of interacting with children. Both Head Start and private centers participating in state-funded full-day 4K will be invited to participate. Implement Parents as Teachers home visitation for children who score low on DIAL 3 or PALS Pre-K. Will also collaborate with Florence 2 to leverage grant funds. | TPOT |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount**  **Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2015-16 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Florence 2** | $239,000 | Increase the quantity and quality of teacher-child interactions, improve early literacy and numeracy instruction in 4K and engage families to assist their children in activities that improve school readiness. District will implement the Building Blocks curriculum to improve students' math skills and the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool to enhance the relationship between teachers and their students. TPOT promotes the social-emotional confidence of young children by training adults on effective ways of interacting with children. Implement Parents as Teachers home visitation for children who score low on DIAL 3 or PALS Pre-K. | TPOT |
| **Jasper** | $250,000 | In partnership with Clemson, implement ECERS-3 to enhance and increase professional learning opportunities for staff members within the school district and partnering agencies. A weeklong Preschool Academy during the summer will address priority issues before the start of the 2016-17 school year. Monthly professional development workshops for all staff members and partnership agencies will be held to support Preschool Academy training.  Utilize results of CLASS and ECERS-3 to develop a process for continuous quality  improvement. | ECERS-3 |
| **Lexington 3** | $216,437 | Ready in 3 is a collaboration to improve literacy and numeracy readiness of students through the use of Montessori curriculum while building better partnerships with families and the community. The Montessori model for instruction will be combined with a parent and community education outreach plan. Approximately 75 students will be served in Montessori classrooms at Batesburg-Leesville Primary School during the 2016-17 school year. Job shadowing and practicum experiences will also be provided for Teacher Cadet students at Batesburg-Leesville High School. | TPOT |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount**  **Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2015-16 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Spartanburg 7** | $194,466 | The Spartanburg Quality Counts Pre-K Coalition Project will create and sustain high-quality 4K learning environments for all publicly-funded 4K programs utilizing research-based Spartanburg Quality Counts Quality Improvement and Rating System. Services will be offered to Cleveland Academy, ZL Madden Head Start and three private centers that participate in state-funded full-day 4K. Additional professional development will be provided in partnership with District 4's professional development conference. An additional 25 days of instructions will be added for 4K students at Cleveland Academy of Leadership. Project will also coordinate districtwide common messaging, enrollment dates, enrollment portal and  preschool placements for all publicly-funded preschool providers. | CLASS |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2016-17 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Cherokee** | $10,000 | Provide second-year funding to augment current LENA program with purchase of books and materials for at-home reading engagement. | CLASS |
| **Chesterfield** | $10,000 | Provide second-year funding for the purchase of additional books and materials for at- home reading engagement. | ELLCO |
| **Pee Dee Consortium** | $250,000 | Building upon the FY 2015-16 awards to Florence 1 and 2, the Pee Dee Consortium will provide educator professional development training and support to enhance children’s social-emotional development using TPOT and the Pyramid Model.  Additional math and early literacy curricula and training on teaching children in poverty. Consortium partners include Florence 1, 2, 3, 4, Marion, Dillon 3 and 4, and the Pee Dee Head Start. The project will be staffed by a Project Manager to oversee  all project-related activities and outcomes. | TPOT |
| **Lancaster** | $164,000 | Staffed with certified teachers, expand the school calendar to include 35 additional days during the summer of 2017. Implement a nine-week Baby College component that will enhance family engagement and reading at home. Serve up to 60 families each year. Baby College is an intensive parent outreach and support component that encourages parents to promote young children’s language, motor and social skill  development and sustain mutual support relationships with other parents. | CLASS, Bracken School Readiness Assessment, Moos Family Environment Scale |
| **Richland 1** | $118,000 | Focusing on the Eau Claire cluster, provide teacher professional development during the summer, with follow-up monthly professional development sessions and onsite coaching sessions using CLASS. Offer multiple parent engagement sessions for 180 families to engage in early learning initiatives that support and enhance a strong  home-school connection, using Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory. | CLASS, Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI) |
| **York** | $84,000 | Host a community event to increase registration for kindergarten and provide 45 students with Countdown to Kindergarten summer home visitation. Enroll 75 students in three additional weeks of summer camp prior to entry into kindergarten. Enhance family engagement with family nights in the community with transportation provided. Provide teacher professional development for all district and Head Start staff in Pyramid Model for social-emotional development. Train at least one administrator  and one teacher leader in TPOT to support teachers. | TPOT |
| **Lexington 4** | $201,000 | Provide intensive staff training using the Pyramid Model and TPOT to support social- emotional development of students. Provide one-year start-up funds for an onsite mental health counselor, in partnership with Lexington County, to provide intensive  intervention for at-risk four-year-olds and their families. | TPOT, Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BESS) and  BASC-2. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Amount**  **Awarded** | **Project Description** | **Project Measures** |
| **FY 2016-17 Grant Awards** | | | |
| **Spartanburg 7** | $142,000 | Expand the Spartanburg Quality Country Kindergarten Readiness Project to Spartanburg 3. Implement the Early Development Instrument (EDI), a research- based tool for communities to identify and address readiness challenges and  strengths of students prior to kindergarten. | ECERS-3, CLASS, ELLCO, EDI |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District | Amount Awarded | Project Description | Project Measures | Project Contacts |
| FY 2017-18 Grant Awards | | | | |
| Cherokee | 206,857 | Increase high-quality teacher-child interaction as measured by CLASS and extend the evidence-based parenting program to improve home language and literacy environments as measured by the Language Environment Analysis (LENA) tool. | CLASS, LENA | Fiscal Agent: Steve Bratton, Director of Finance (864) 206-2204, steve.bratton@cherokee1.org  Project Coordinator: Laura Camp, Coordinator of Early Childhood (864) 206-2203, laura.camp@cherokee.org |
| Chesterfield | 105,613 | Improve current 4K curriculum and teacher practices through job-embedded ongoing professional development that will address opportunities for teacher and child interactions their effect on literacy and mathematical thinking. Provide fall and spring literacy and math readiness workshops for families. Provide students with books for home libraries and equip classrooms with books for read alouds. | ELLCO | Fiscal Agent: Brad Willard, CFO (843) 623-2175, [bwillard@chesterfieldschools.org](mailto:bwillard@chesterfieldschools.org)  Project Coordinator: Wendy Folsom, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, (843) 623-5509, [wfolsom@chesterfieldschools.org](mailto:wfolsom@chesterfieldschools.org) |
| Florence 1/  Pee Dee Consortium | 187,350 | Building upon the FY 2015-16 and 2016-17 awards to Florence 1 and 2, the Pee Dee Consortium will provide educator professional development training and support to enhance children’s social-emotional development using TPOT and the Pyramid Model. Additional math and early literacy curricula and training on teaching children in poverty. Consortium partners include Florence 1, 2, 3, 4, Marion, Dillon 3 and 4, Darlington and the Pee Dee Head Start. The project will be staffed by a Project Manager to oversee all project-related activities and outcomes. | TPOT | Fiscal Agent: Stanley Brunson, Asst. Superintendent for Finance, (843) 673-1112, [rbrunson@fsd1.org](mailto:rbrunson@fsd1.org)  Project Coordinator: Dr. Floyd Creech, Director of School Readiness (843) 673-1129, [fcreech@fsd1.org](mailto:fcreech@fsd1.org) |
| Lancaster | 126,923 | Enhance existing 4K program in a high-poverty Priority School by establishing a parent engagement and support component, transition into kindergarten and classroom assessment tool. Implement Harlem Children’s Zone Baby College. Expand the 4K calendar to include 24 additional days during the summer of 2018. This project is part of a larger community project to improve student college and career readiness. | CLASS | Fiscal Agent: Tony Walker, Director of Finance (803) 416-8818, [tony.walker@lcsdmail.net](mailto:tony.walker@lcsdmail.net)  Project Coordinator: Dr. Paul McKenzie, Director of Research (803) 416-8862, [paul.mckenzie@lcsdmail.net](mailto:paul.mckenzie@lcsdmail.net) |
| McCormick | 147,283 | Increase the quantity and quality of teacher-child interactions to improve social, emotional and academic outcomes for all 4K children in McCormick by implementing CLASS. Also provide a systematic approach for professional development and provide an Early Childhood Instructional Coach for all district 4K teachers, Head Start and a child care provider. | CLASS | Fiscal Agent: Jackie Brown, Director of Finance (864) 852-2435 ext. 237, [brownj@mccormick.k12.sc.us](mailto:brownj@mccormick.k12.sc.us)  Project Coordinator: Mary Greene Thomasson, Director of Federal Programs (864) 852-2435 ext. 225,  [thomassonm@mccormick.k12.sc.us](mailto:thomassonm@mccormick.k12.sc.us) |
| District | Amount Awarded | Project Description | Project Measures | Project Contacts |
| FY 2017-18 Grant Awards | | | | |
| Spartanburg 7 and Spartanburg 3 | 128,724 | Expand the Spartanburg Quality Country Kindergarten Readiness expansion project will continue to use classroom assessments to drive teacher and student growth by sustaining work at Cleveland Academy of leadership and District 3 and expand to include an additional eight classrooms at the Early Learning Center at Park Hills. | CLASS,  ECERS 3, EDI | Fiscal Agent and Project Coordinator: Dr. Terry Pruitt, Deputy Superintendent (864) 594-4400, [topruitt@spart7.org](mailto:topruitt@spart7.org)  Spartanburg 3 Contact: Ms. Jean Brewington, Director of Elementary Education, [jbrewington@spartanburg3.org](mailto:jbrewington@spartanburg3.org) |
| York 1 | 97,250 | Building a strong foundation for transition to kindergarten including the engagement of families in supporting their children’s education, summer literacy and numeracy learning opportunities and curriculum improvements to ensure rising kindergarten students have a solid social and emotional foundation upon which to build. | ELLCO | Fiscal Agent: Sherry Hernandez, Finance Manager (803) 684-9916, shernandez@york.k12.sc.us  Project Coordinator: Lisa Spangler, Coordinator of Special Projects, (803) 684-9916, lspangler@york.k12.sc.us |

1. For purposes of this RFP, “state-funded full-day 4K” is the same as South Carolina Child Development Education Program (CDEP) and South Carolina Early Reading Development and Education Program (CERDEP). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Barnett, B., Frieman-Krauss, A., Weisenfeld, GG., Horowitz, M., Kasmin, R., Squires, J. (2017). The State of Preschool 2016. p.6. National Institute for Early Education Research. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University. May be accessed online at: [http://nieer.org/wp-](http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Executive-Summary_8.21.17.pdf) [content/uploads/2017/08/Executive-Summary\_8.21.17.pdf.](http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Executive-Summary_8.21.17.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Halle, T., Vick Whittaker, J. E., & Anderson, R. (2010). Quality in Early Childhood Care and Education Settings: A Compendium of Measures, Second Edition. Washington, DC: Child Trends. Prepared by Child Trends for the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. May be accessed online at: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/complete_compendium_full.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Note: Match contribution amounts should correspond with values provided in Attachment 11.1 and 11.2 (Budget). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Halle, T., Vick Whittaker, J. E., & Anderson, R. (2010). Quality in Early Childhood Care and Education Settings: A Compendium of Measures, Second Edition. Washington, DC: Child Trends. Prepared by Child Trends for the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. May be accessed online at: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/complete_compendium_full.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)