



FINAL REPORT 2001-2002 RETRAINING GRANT PROGRAM

South Carolina
Education Oversight Committee
Agency A-85

Chairman
Robert Staton

October 2002

**FINAL REPORT
2001-2002 RETRAINING GRANT PROGRAM**

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The Education Accountability Act (§59-18-1560) establishes grant programs for schools or districts designated as below average or unsatisfactory: "The State Board of Education, working with the Accountability Division and the Department of Education, must establish grant programs for schools designated as below average and for schools designated as unsatisfactory. A school designated as below average will qualify for a grant to undertake any needed retraining of school faculty and administration once the revised plan is determined by the State Department of Education to meet the criteria on high standards and effective activities. A school designated as unsatisfactory will qualify for the grant program after the State Board of Education approves its revised plan. A grant or a portion of a grant may be renewed annually over the next three years, if school and district actions to implement the revised plan continue. Should student performance not improve, any revisions to the plan must meet high standards prior to renewal of the grant. The revised plan must be reviewed by the district and board of trustees and the State Department of Education to determine what other actions, if any, need to be taken. A grant may be extended for up to two additional years, if the State Board of Education determines it is needed to sustain academic improvement. The funds must be expended based on the revised plan and according to criteria established by the State Board of Education. Prior to extending any grant, the Accountability Division shall review school expenditures to make a determination of the effective use of previously awarded grant funds. If deficient use is determined, those deficiencies must be identified, noted, and corrective action taken before a grant extension will be given."

PROCEDURES

The Division of Accountability has reviewed the guidelines for the Retraining Assistance Grants for School Faculty and Administration, the Report on the Retraining Grant funds for 1998-1999, the Report on the Retraining Grant funds for 1999-2000, the Report on the Retraining Grant funds for 2000-2001, and responses to an on-line questionnaire developed and administered by the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff with contributions by State Department of Education (SDE) staff. The on-line survey included information regarding amount of funds budgeted and spent, the number of teachers and administrators served and, as appropriate, explanations of the use of funds. The survey also gathered important demographic information on the school, including the length of service at the school by the principal and the teachers, the education level of both groups, and the years of experience of both groups. Finally, the survey gathered information from the principal on the benefits of the Retraining Grant Program, support for the program from the superintendent and school board, and the availability of funding and consultant services.

The academic year 2001-02 is the first year that receipt of a Retraining Grant was based on the report card rating. Prior to 2001-02, schools that received Retraining Grants were located in the seven school districts that were listed as "impaired" in accordance with the Education Improvement Act of 1984. Thirty schools received a Retraining Grant in 2000-01. After the issuance of the first School Report Card, 256 schools qualified for the Retraining Grant Program; 102 schools as unsatisfactory and 154 as below average. Of the 256 schools, 24 received money the three previous years because they are located in the formerly "impaired" school districts.

Schools rated unsatisfactory received notification that they qualified for the Retraining Grant Program in either November or December of 2001. Representatives from the schools were encouraged to attend a workshop on planning for the Retraining Grant Program and were provided a list of pre-approved activities from which they could select professional development opportunities for their schools. The planning workshops occurred in January and February 2002 with the expectation that the final School

Renewal Plan for each school would be submitted for approval by April 1, 2002. As part of the planning process, the Office Of School Quality at SDE required each school to focus the activities on two goals: improvement of student achievement and improvement of parental and community involvement. Schools were expected to plan at least one activity to improve parental and community involvement.

Schools rated below average did not receive notification of their Retraining Grants until mid-April 2002. The schools rated below average had one opportunity to attend the planning workshop in June 2002. Most schools rated below average did not take advantage of the opportunity, but the Office of School Quality did make the information presented in the workshop available to the schools upon request. Schools rated below average had until October 1, 2002 to submit a School Renewal Plan. Once again the Office of School Quality required each school to focus the activities on two goals: improvement of student achievement and improvement of parental and community involvement.

Funding for the retraining grants is provided through the State Department of Education. Each school is allocated a set amount per teacher. For the 2001-2002 school year, the allocated amount per certificated staff member at schools rated unsatisfactory was \$500; the amount per certificated staff member at schools rated below average was \$330.

Disbursement of the Retraining Grant funds also changed for the 2001-02 year. The change in disbursements occurred at the direction of the Office of Finance at the SDE. Prior to 2001-02, schools received the full amount of their funds upon the approval of their plan. Schools were allowed by proviso to carry forward funds not expended for fiscal years 1998-99 and 1999-2000, but all money should have been expended for the year 2000-01 or returned to the State. Beginning with 2001-02, schools received 25% of the allotted funds up front in order to conduct pre-approved activities, but the remainder of funds were provided as reimbursements for completed activities. School districts were expected to expend local funds and be reimbursed by the state.

Of significance is the fact that most schools did not spend the allotted funds during the 2001-02 school year. Schools rated unsatisfactory had half of the school year in which to expend the funds, and schools rated below average had just over two months in which to spend the funds. Coupled with the short time in which to spend the funds and the fact that a School Renewal Plan had to be submitted and approved prior to expenditure of funds over the 25% initially transferred funds, schools had little opportunity to spend the funds. Over \$4.5 million was allocated to the retraining grant program in 2001-02. As part of the survey of the schools, the schools were asked how much of their allocation they spent. Of the 215 schools that responded to the survey, 105 spent no money during 2001-2002, and only 28 schools spent the entire amount of their grant during the fiscal year. SDE anticipated that the schools would be unable to spend the money by the end of fiscal year 2002 and requested a proviso in the 2002-03 budget to allow the schools to carry the money forward for expenditure in 2002-03. However, the Office of Finance of the State Department of Education has requested that the funds be spent no later than December 1, 2002.

Schools receiving Retraining Grant funds were asked to complete a survey about how the funds were spent. The survey was available on-line and initially the principals had four weeks to complete the survey. By the end of the allotted time, less than 25% of the principals had responded. The deadline was extended twice for a total of six weeks. At the final deadline, 215 of the 256 principals had responded to at least one portion of the survey, a response rate of 83.7%. A copy of the survey is attached as the Appendix.

The survey consisted of five parts: a registration area where school name, principal's name, amount of grant awarded, amount of grant spent, and similar questions were asked. A respondent was required to complete part one of the survey in order to proceed with the remainder of the survey. Of the 215 responses, 20 completed only part one.

Part two of the survey requested information on the principal. The questions included information on the educational level of the principal, years of experience as a principal and in education as a whole, and information on how long the principal had been at the school. Information on the principal was requested in order to track the stability and experience of the leadership at the school.

Part three of the survey requested information on the certificated staff. Questions included information on the number of certificated staff positions at the school, number of non-certificated teachers at the school, number of teachers participating in the Teacher Loan Program, and educational level of the certificated staff. Information on teacher turnover, educational experience of the staff and longevity of the staff at the school also was collected. Teacher stability and educational level of the teaching staff are important to the potential success of the Retraining Grant Program, for if the staff of a school is constantly changing year after year, the long-term impact of the Retraining Grant Program at the school will be significantly reduced.

Part four of the survey contained Likert scale questions focusing on five areas: the Retraining Grant Program, Funding, the Planning Process, Support for the Program, and General Information on the activities conducted. Respondents were asked to respond to 33 statements by choosing Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree from a pull down menu. Responses to the statements are contained in the table below.

LIKERT SCALE RESPONSE COUNT

STATEMENTS	RESPONSES					
	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided	Did Not Respond
Section I. The Program						
Teachers benefited from the program	11%	0%	37%	0%	7%	46%
Teachers used in class what they learned	20%	0%	25%	0%	9%	46%
Teachers felt pressured by the program	8%	29%	1%	7%	9%	46%
Student achievement was affected positively	22%	0%	14%	17%	0%	47%
Staff responsibilities for activities were identified	28%	0%	22%	0%	4%	45%
The program fostered improved instruction	21%	0%	27%	0%	7%	45%
Procedures exist to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on student needs and state assessment scores	31%	1%	15%	1%	7%	46%
Procedures exist to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on the school's Parental Involvement Goal(s)	27%	4%	6%	1%	17%	46%
Section II. Funding						
Funding was available in a timely manner	24%	23%	12%	11%	6%	24%
Funding was available for innovative professional development	33%	2%	32%	1%	6%	26%
The program adequately supported the implementation of the School Renewal Plan	32%	1%	33%	1%	5%	27%
The reimbursement model did not hinder implementation of the process	28%	7%	13%	3%	20%	29%
District procurement procedures did not hinder the process	30%	6%	19%	1%	16%	29%
SDE procurement procedures did not hinder the process	31%	4%	16%	2%	18%	29%
Consultant resources were available	42%	1%	19%	0%	9%	28%
Section III. The Planning Process						
Guidelines for the Retraining Grant Program were clear	45%	8%	18%	2%	7%	21%
The SDE Model Revision Process for the program was helpful	44%	2%	18%	0%	12%	23%
SDE assistance was available	47%	1%	24%	0%	6%	22%
SDE assistance was utilized	44%	8%	20%	0%	5%	23%
SDE Pre-Approved Activities were utilized	37%	12%	18%	1%	6%	27%
Timeline for the Retraining Grant did not hinder implementation	25%	20%	9%	9%	13%	23%
Faculty were involved in the planning process	47%	3%	24%	0%	3%	23%
The School Improvement Council was involved in the planning process	52%	7%	15%	0%	3%	23%

Section IV. Support	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided	Did Not Respond
The school board was supportive of the Retraining Grant activities	37%	0%	31%	0%	8%	24%
The superintendent was supportive of the Retraining Grant activities	32%	0%	43%	0%	1%	23%
GENERAL INFORMATION						
Professional development was scheduled to minimize teacher absences during class time	27%	1%	41%	0%	2%	28%
Professional development was scheduled at times teachers could attend	32%	0%	38%	0%	2%	28%
Each activity was evaluated for effectiveness throughout the year	31%	2%	14%	0%	20%	33%
Teachers had adequate time to practice skills learned	32%	5%	15%	0%	14%	34%
Professional development emphasized active participant involvement	36%	0%	32%	0%	2%	29%
Professional development activities were based on research	32%	0%	37%	0%	2%	28%
Professional development activities were aligned with previous activities	37%	1%	24%	0%	6%	31%
Administrators participated in the professional development activities with teachers	34%	0%	33%	0%	3%	29%

The responses to several statements bear reflection. Respondents indicated that teachers benefit from the Retraining Grant Program and that the teachers use what they learn through the Program in class. Respondents were less certain that student achievement was affected by the Program, a logical response since the Program had not been in effect in most of these schools long enough to make a solid determination. The respondents also stated that school boards and superintendents supported the activities held at the school.

Respondents were divided on several issues. Less than 47% stated that funding was provided in a timely manner, and just 41% believed the reimbursement model did not hinder the implementation of the Program. There was some concern that school district procurement procedures hampered implementation of the Program (48.8% believed their district procurement procedures did not hamper the Program) and concern that State Department of Education (SDE) procurement procedures hampered implementation of the Program (47% believed SDE procurement procedures did not hamper the Program). Several principals indicated the reimbursement model was a problem because the school districts were short on funds due to budget reductions and school districts were unwilling to expend funds up front because they were concerned the funds would not be reimbursed.

Of primary concern from the Likert scale responses is the area of evaluation of the activities conducted under the Program. Less than one-third of the respondents stated that procedures existed to evaluate the effectiveness of the program based on the school's Parental Involvement Goals, and less than 50% believed that procedures existed to evaluate the effectiveness of the program based on student needs and state assessment scores. Sound ongoing evaluation of development activities is crucial to long-term effectiveness of any professional development program. Less than half of the respondents to the survey (45.1%) believed each activity held as part of the Program was evaluated for effectiveness throughout the year.

Responses to the Likert scale statements should change as respondents have more experience with the Retraining Grant Program. However, the responses to the statements this year indicate that care and time needs to be given to evaluation of the activities provided under the Program. Review of procurement procedures and the disbursement/reimbursement process should occur to address the concerns expressed through the survey.

Part five of the survey requested information on the specific activities funded through the Retraining Grant Program. Respondents could provide up to seven different activities and were asked to provide planned activities if no activities had actually been conducted. Information requested on each activity included whether the activity was a continuation of an earlier activity or if the activity was from the list of pre-approved activities provided by SDE. Respondents also provided information on the content area the

activity addressed, the format of the activity, the objective or strategy the activity addressed from the School Renewal Plan of the school, how many teachers and administrators participated in the activity, and what kind of follow-up was provided for the activity.

The statute uses the phrase "effective use". For purposes of this evaluation, "effective use" was defined as having the intended or expected effect which is improved professional practice resulting in higher levels of student achievement. In previous years, student performance information on the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT) at the elementary and middle school levels and Exit Exam, SAT/ACT and Advanced Placement scores at the high school level were used to determine effective use. School profile information provided through PACT was also utilized, as were the activities reported by the schools through the survey.

The criteria for effective use are drawn from the South Carolina Department of Education's Standards of Professional Development and published in the guidelines for the retraining grants. The most relevant criteria for the "effective use" review included the following:

- Funds are expended to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement;
- Funds are expended in a manner that addresses the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization;
- Funds are expended in activities that provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up; and
- Funds are expended in a manner that recognizes differing levels of educator expertise (i. e., diverse participant needs).

In previous years, deficiencies were detailed for each school based on the application of these criteria and after reviewing student performance data from each school. This year, however, deficiencies will be noted only for the schools that have received the Retraining Grant funds for more than one year. No deficiencies will be noted for the 232 schools that received money for the first time in 2001-2002 due to the late receipt of funding and the resulting fact that student achievement at the schools would not have been impacted by the Program.

However, schools should take note that the data from the survey this year will be retained and reviewed along with data that will be requested in late spring 2003. Failure to respond to the survey in 2003 will result in the recommendation that funding be terminated for schools that did not respond.

The following portions of this report provide a listing of each school based on length of time in the Retraining Grant Program and/or the Absolute Rating on the 2001 Report Card.

SCHOOLS WHICH RECEIVED FUNDING PRIOR TO 2001-2002

ALLENDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Allendale Elementary School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. At the beginning of the 2001-02 school year, Allendale Elementary School merged with Allendale Primary to form a new Allendale Elementary School. The reconstituted Allendale Elementary School had a new principal and ten first year teachers. During 2001-02, the school conducted four activities. Two activities focused on PreK and kindergarten teachers. A third activity provided training in the South Carolina Readiness Assessment. Participation in the Fall Writing Conference by two teachers was the fourth activity. None of the activities involved more than two teachers and none of the activities included administrators. Achievement on PACT fell in both English/language arts and mathematics in third and fourth grades. In third grade, 52 percent of the student scored below basic on English/language arts, up from 48.8 percent; in mathematics, 52 percent were below basic, up from 43.8 percent. In fourth grade, 53.8 percent scored

below basic on English/language arts, up from 39.1 percent, and in mathematics, 59.3 percent scored below basic, up from 41.3 percent. Fifth grade students were not at the school in 2000-01, but in 2001-02, 68.9 percent were below basic in English/language arts and 77.4 percent were below basic in mathematics.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Allendale Fairfax High School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. As part of the Retraining Program at the school this year, four activities were conducted. Two activities were continuations of previous activities and two were not. One activity was the development of a curriculum guide for science, but only one teacher out of 54 staff members participated. An activity on discipline was attended by only six of the 54 teachers at the school. The other two programs served one teacher each. Administrators did not participate in three of the four activities. The principal of the school and seven of the 54 teachers were new to the school last year. Student achievement on the Exit Exam fell significantly in all three areas. In reading, 55.7 percent passed, down from 71.7 percent the previous year; 63.4 percent passed mathematics, down from 80 percent; and, 61.4 percent passed writing, down from 76.7 percent. The percentage passing all three tests on the first attempt fell from 56.7 percent in 2001 to 36.1 percent in 2002. SAT scores, on the other hand, increased 26 points with an increase in the number of students taking the test. Seventeen AP tests were taken but none were scored at 3 or better.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Allendale Fairfax Middle School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted seven activities through the Retraining Grant program during 2001-2002. Three of the activities were continuations of previous activities and four were new. Six of the seven activities concentrated on programs dealing with content and standards, and the seventh activity focused on pedagogy. All of the teachers were involved with one or more of the activities. Ten of the 27 teachers were new to the school in 2001-02, as was the principal. Seven teachers were first year teachers. Student achievement on PACT showed improvement in English/language arts for both seventh and eighth graders. 48.3 percent of seventh graders scored below basic, down from 58.6 percent, and 52.7 percent of eighth graders were below basic, down from 56.4 percent. Sixth graders were at the school for the first time in 2001-02 and 54.5 percent scored below basic on the English/language arts examination. On the mathematics portion of the test, 58.4 percent of the sixth graders scored below basic. The percentage of students scoring below basic on the mathematics test decreased for seventh graders, with 59.2 percent scoring below basic, down from 65.8 percent. Scores for eighth graders decreased; 70.3 scored below basic, up from 53.8 percent.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Fairfax Elementary School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card. During 2001-02, the school offered only one activity, Montessori training for PreK and kindergarten teachers. The teacher turnover rate at the school was low, with only 2 new teachers being reported, and 2001-02 was the second year for the principal. Results on PACT were mixed. Scores for third and sixth graders improved for both English/language arts and mathematics. In English/language arts, 13.6 percent of third graders

were below basic, down from 45.1 percent; in mathematics, 31.8 percent were below basic, down from 57.7 percent. For sixth graders, 32.6 percent were below basic on English/language arts, down from 67.6 percent; 32.6 percent were below basic in mathematics, down from 48.6 percent. Scores for fourth graders fell in both mathematics and English/language arts; 51 percent were below basic in English/language arts, up from 31.4 percent, and 54.9 percent were below basic in mathematics, up from 36 percent. Fifth grade scores improved for English/language arts: 34.6 percent scored below basic, down from 38.1, but mathematics scored dropped as 51.9 percent scored below basic, up from 48.9 percent.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

BAMBERG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Denmark-Olar Elementary School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted five activities, of which four were new and one was a continuation. Three of the activities focused on content and standards. The vast majority of the teachers and two administrators attended three of the activities. Twenty-five percent of the teaching staff was new to the school in 2001-02, and included five first year teachers. It was the second year at the school for the principal. English/language arts scores declined in third grade; 34.2 percent of third graders scored below basic, up from 19.3 percent. There was a small improvement in fourth grade, with 37.7 percent scoring below basic, down from 37.9 percent. Fifth graders had 43.3 percent below basic, down from 50.7 percent. Mathematics scores improved for fourth and fifth graders; 34.2 percent were below basic in fourth grade, down from 50 percent, while 59.3 percent were below basic in fifth grade, down from 75.3 percent. Mathematics scores fell in the third grade; 45.3 percent were below basic, up from 26.5 percent.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Denmark-Olar High School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. During 2001-02, the school conducted two activities. Both activities came from the SDE pre-approved activities list and were new to the school. The entire teaching staff and administration attended both activities. One activity focused on pedagogy, the other on school climate. The principal was new to the school in 2001-02 as were six of the 27 teachers. Student achievement on the Exit Exam increased in two areas: 58 percent of students passed mathematics on the first try, up from 28.8 percent, while writing increased to 60 percent from 47.9 percent. In reading, the percentage of students passing fell to 60 percent from 64.2 percent. The percentage of students passing all three sections increased to 38 percent, up from 19.4 percent. Average SAT scores for seniors fell from 793 to 786. Sixteen AP tests were taken but none were scored at 3 or better.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Denmark-Olar Middle School, for the third time in four years, provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

CLARENDON SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Scott's Branch High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Scott's Branch Intermediate School, named Scott's Branch Middle in previous years, received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted four activities during the 2001-02 school year, and all four were continuations of previous activities. Two activities were attended by the entire faculty, the other two served less than five teachers and no administrators. One activity focused on school climate, the other three addressed alignment and implementation of the state standards. The principal has been at the school for six years, and in 2001-02, only one teacher was new to the school. Student achievement on the PACT test improved for both sixth and seventh grade in mathematics, and for English/language arts in the sixth grade. The percentage of student scoring below basic on the seventh grade English/language arts test increased slightly from 41.3 percent to 41.8 percent. Fourth and fifth graders were tested as part of the school for the first time in 2002; previously, they had been at Scott's Branch Elementary. On the English/language arts test, 38.6 percent of fourth graders scored below basic and 47.1 percent of fifth grader scored below basic. 40.2 percent of fourth graders scored below basic on the mathematics test, as did 33.3 percent of fifth graders.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

FLORENCE SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Brockington Elementary School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted four activities during the 2001-02 school year. Two were continuations from pervious activities and two were new. All four activities focused on content and standards. None of the activities was attended by more than seven of the 42 teachers at the school, and administrators did not attend two of the activities. Five teachers and the principal were new to the school in 2001-02. Improvement at all three grades levels in both English/language arts and mathematics occurred on the PACT test. In English/language arts, 33.3 percent scored below basic, down from 44.5 percent, while 35.4 percent scored below basic in mathematics, down from 47.2 percent. In fourth grade students also improved, with 35.4 percent scoring below basic on English/language arts, down from 46.5 percent, and 36.4 percent scored below basic on mathematics, down from 54.9 percent. On English/language arts, 48.5 percent of the fifth grade students scored below basic, down from 71.1 percent; in mathematics 39.7 percent scored below basic, down from 79.2 percent.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

Johnson Middle School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted five activities during the 2001-02 school year. Two of the activities were continuations of previous activities and three were new. Three or fewer of the 19 teachers at the school participated in four of the five activities. Thirteen teachers participated in the fifth activity, attendance at the Middle School Conference in Myrtle Beach. Administrators participated in only two of the activities. The principal and eight of the 19 teachers were new to the school in 2001-02. PACT scores on English/language arts varied depending on the grade level. In sixth grade, 62.2 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, up from 60.2 percent; 58.2 percent scored below basic in the seventh grade, down from 61.7 percent; and, in eighth grade 57.5 percent scored below basic, up from 56.8 percent. Mathematics scores improved in sixth and eighth grade; in the sixth grade 74.3 percent scored below basic compared to 77.3 percent the previous year. In eighth grade, 57.5 percent scored below basic compared with 67.9

percent the previous year. In seventh grade mathematics scores regressed: 63.7 percent scored below basic in sixth grade, up from 51.9 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Timmonsville High School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted three activities. All of the activities were continuations from previous years. Administrators participated in two activities. Most teachers had the opportunity to attend at least one activity. One activity focused on professional growth, another on technology, and the third on standards and content. The principal and six of the 26 teachers were new to the school in 2001-02. Exit Exam scores showed a decrease in the success rate for first time takers in all areas of the test. The percent passing all three areas fell to 49.2 percent from 69.7 percent; those passing reading decreased to 64.4 percent from 74.2 percent, mathematics decreased to 57.6 percent from 78.8 percent, and writing decreased to 72.4 percent from 78.8 percent. The average SAT score for the school increased 33 points, from 807 to 840. Ten AP tests were taken but none were scored at 3 or better.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

JASPER COUNTY SCHOOLS

Jasper High School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted seven activities, two of which were continuations from previous years. Two activities focused on content and standards, the other five addressed pedagogy. Administrators participated in all seven activities and all but one activity involved at least 10 of the 42 teachers at the school. The principal was in place for only half of the year and 12 teachers were new to the school in 2001-02. Six of the twelve were first year teachers. Student achievement on the exit exam decreased on all sub-tests. In reading, 67.4 percent passed, down from 72 percent; 61.3 percent passed mathematics, down from 61.5 percent; and 64.0 percent passed writing, down from 64.1 percent. Overall 41.3 percent passed all three tests, down from 48.1 percent. SAT scores decreased from 769 to 768. Thirty-five AP tests were taken but none were scored at 3 or better.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Ridgeland Elementary School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted no activities under the Retraining Grant Program, having received notification of the money in April. Seven activities are planned for 2002-03. The principal was in her second year and 14 teachers were new in 2001-02. The principal expected no less than eight teachers to leave by the beginning of the 2002-03 school year. Student achievement improved in the fourth grade in both English/language arts and mathematics. On the English/language arts test, 36.4 percent of fourth graders scored below basic, down from 39.7 percent, and in mathematics, 50 percent scored below basic, down from 56.9 percent. In third grade, 39.7 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, up from 38.8 percent, while 45.3 percent scored below basic in mathematics, up from 40.1 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

Ridgeland Middle School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted seven activities. Two activities were continuations from previous years. Six of the seven activities addressed content or standards; the seventh activity focused on professional growth. Five of the activities served five or fewer teachers. Administrators did not participate in three of the activities. Fourteen of the 40 teachers were new to the school in 2001-02 and it was the second year for the principal. Student achievement in the fifth grade improved in both English/language arts and mathematics with 54.3 percent scoring below basic in English/language arts, down from 59.8 percent; 71.4 percent of students scored below basic in mathematics, down from 75.8 percent. Achievement in the sixth grade improved in mathematics; 66.7 percent scored below basic, down from 71.9 percent; in English/language arts scores digressed, 69.1 percent scored below basic, up from 65.8 percent. Seventh grade scores went down. On English/language arts, 63.1 percent scored below basic, up from 60.6 percent, and in mathematics, 82.7 percent scored below basic, up from 77.8 percent. Eighth grade improved in mathematics, 68.8 percent scored below basic, down from 73.5 percent; 67.1 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, up from 61.3 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

West Hardeeville Elementary School received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted six activities. All of the activities were new. Two activities focused on content and standards and four on professional growth. None of the activities served more than four of the 56 teachers. Administrators participated in three of the activities. The principal was new to the school in 2001-02 as were 10 teachers. Student achievement in third, fifth, sixth and eighth grade improved in both areas, while results were mixed in fourth grade and regressed in both areas in seventh grade. In third grade, 54.1 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, down from 54.7 percent, and 69 percent scored below basic in mathematics, down from 73.5 percent. Fourth grade scores were: 43.5 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, up from 32.1 percent, and in mathematics, 56.7 percent scored below basic, down from 67.1 percent. In fifth grade, 35 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, down from 52.3 percent, and 55 percent scored below basic in mathematics, down from 76.1 percent. In the sixth grade, 57.4 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, down from 58.9 percent, while 64.2 percent scored below basic in mathematics, down from 74.7 percent. Seventh graders digressed in English/language arts, where 48.6 percent scored below basic, up from 38.7 percent, and in mathematics as 62.5 percent scored below basic, up from 52.4 percent. Eighth graders improved in both areas; 37 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, down from 55.8 percent, and in mathematics 52.2 percent scored below basic, down from 86.5 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Deficiency: The acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement for all teachers was not provided.

Deficiency: The differing levels of educator expertise were not provided for.

LEE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Bishopville Intermediate School (recently renamed Dennis Intermediate School) received an unsatisfactory rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted two activities, both of which were new to the school. One activity focused on professional growth of teachers and the other addressed content and standards. All teachers participated in one activity and about half of the 27 teachers at the school participated in the other. Administrators participated in both. Seven of the teachers were new to the school in 2001-02 and it was the second year for the principal. Student achievement improved in all grades in both English/language arts and mathematics. In fourth grade, 37.8 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, down from 46.8 percent, and in mathematics, 53.8 percent scored below basic,

down from 60.5 percent. In the fifth grade, English/language arts scores improved as 59.4 percent scored below basic, down from 68.5 percent, and in mathematics a gain was noted as 65.4 percent scored below basic compared with 79.1 percent the previous year. In sixth grade, 59.8 percent scored below basic in English/language arts, down from 69 percent, while in mathematics, 56.3 percent scored below basic, down from 69.6 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Fleming Intermediate School did not respond to the survey.

Lower Lee Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Mount Pleasant Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

West Lee Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

MARION SCHOOL DISTRICT 7

Rains/Centenary/Pleasant Grove Elementary School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card. The school conducted three activities with the Retraining Grant funds, all of which were continuations from previous years. Two activities focused content and standards and one on pedagogy. Seven teachers participated in the program to assist teachers in obtaining a master's degree. Approximately half of the faculty participated in each of the other two activities. Administrators participated in one activity. There were no new teachers at the school in 2001-02 and it was the second year for the principal. Student achievement in the third grade digressed in English/language arts as 48.4 percent scored below basic, up from 26.8 percent, but improved in mathematics, as 40.6 percent scored below basic, down from 52.1 percent. In the fourth grade, 22 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, down from 34.2 percent, and in mathematics, 31.7 percent scored below basic, up from 26.7 percent. Fifth grade also showed mixed results as 48.8 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, up from 47.2 percent, but in mathematics 31.7 percent scored below basic, down from 70 percent. In the sixth grade 42.9 percent scored below basic on the mathematics portion, down from 48.9 percent, and in English/language arts, 61.2 percent scored below basic, up from 60.4 percent.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

Terrell's Bay High School received a below average rating on the 2001 report card for grades 7 and 8, and an unsatisfactory rating for grades 9-12. The school conducted three activities, two of which were continuations from previous years. Two activities focused on the area of content and standards and one on professional growth. The entire faculty participated in two of the activities. Administrators participated in all three activities. Four teachers were new to the school in 2001-02, as was the principal. Student achievement on the PACT regressed in both seventh and eighth grades. On English/language arts, 55.2 percent of seventh graders scored below basic, up from 41.8 percent, while in mathematics, 74.6 percent scored below basic, up from 65.5 percent. In the eighth grade, 53.4 percent scored below basic on English/language arts, up from 33.3 percent, and in mathematics, 67.8 percent scored below basic, up from 47.8 percent. All sub-tests of the exit exam improved. In mathematics, 63.2 percent passed, up from 61.9 percent, and in reading 68.4 percent passed, up from 64.3 percent. The percentage of students passing all three sections increased to 52.6 percent from 47.6 percent. In writing

there 89.5 percent passed, an increase from 71.4 percent. The average SAT score decreased, down 94 points from 905 to 811. Only one AP examination was taken and it did not earn a score of 3 or better.

Deficiency: There was inadequate time for practice, feedback, and follow-up activities.

Deficiency: There has been inadequate time to address the three phases of the change process.

SCHOOLS RATED UNSATISFACTORY IN 2001

AIKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Ridge Spring-Monetta Elementary/Middle School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Ridge Spring-Monetta High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

ANDERSON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 5

South Fant Street Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

BARNWELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 19

Blackville-Hilda High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Macedonia Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS

James J. Davis Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Whale Branch Elementary School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Whale Branch Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

BERKELEY COUNTY SCHOOLS

Cainhoy Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Cross High School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CALHOUN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Calhoun County High School did not respond to the survey.

CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Alice Birney Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Baptist Hill High School did not respond to the survey.

Brentwood Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Burke High School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Clyde Sanders Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Edmund A. Burns Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Lincoln High School did not respond to the survey.

Mary Ford Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Morningside Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

M. R. Rivers Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Norman C. Toole Military Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

R. B. Stall High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

R. D. Schroder Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

St. John's High School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Wilmont Fraser Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Luther Vaughn Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Mary Bramlett Elementary School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Central High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

COLLETON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Ruffin High School, which merged with Walterboro High School at the beginning of the 2002-03 school year, reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

DARLINGTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Darlington High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Spaulding Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Spaulding Jr. High School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

DILLON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Dillon High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

J. V. Martin Jr. High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Fairfield Central High School did not respond to the survey.

Fairfield Intermediate School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Fairfield Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Geiger Elementary School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

FLORENCE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Lake City High School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

GEORGETOWN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Carver's Bay Middle School did not respond to the survey.

GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Hollis Academy reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Lakeview Middle School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Monaview Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Parker Academy provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Tanglewood Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

HAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Estill Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Estill High School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Estill Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MARLBORO COUNTY SCHOOLS

Bennettsville Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Clio Elementary/Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Marlboro County High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

McColl Elementary/Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MCCORMICK COUNTY SCHOOLS

McCormick High School did not respond to the survey.

McCormick Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

NEWBERRY COUNTY SCHOOLS

Newberry Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DISTRICT 3

Elloree High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Elloree Elementary School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Holly Hill Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Holly Hill-Roberts High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DISTRICT 5

Bowman High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Brookdale Middle School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Nix Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

North High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Robert E. Howard Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Alcorn Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

C. A. Johnson High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Crane Creek Elementary School, merged with Denny Terrace Elementary School to form Forest Heights Elementary School, reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Eau Claire High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Heyward Gibbes Middle School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Sarah Nance Elementary/Watkins Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

W. A. Perry Middle School did not respond to the survey.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7

Cleveland Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Myles W. Whitlock Jr. High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SUMTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 17

Chestnut Oaks Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SUMTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Mayewood Middle School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

UNION COUNTY SCHOOLS

Jonesville High School did not respond to the survey.

WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SCHOOLS

Battery Park Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

C. E. Murray High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

D. P. Cooper Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Kingstree Sr. High School did not respond to the survey.

YORK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Sunset Park Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SCHOOLS RATED BELOW AVERAGE IN 2001

ABBEVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Calhoun Falls High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

AIKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS

A. L. Corbett Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ANDERSON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 5

Southwood Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

BARNWELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 19

Blackville-Hilda Jr. High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

BARNWELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 45

Guinyard-Butler Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS

Beaufort Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

H. E. MacCraken Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

BERKELEY COUNTY SCHOOLS

Berkeley Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Cross Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

J. K. Gourdin Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Sedgefield Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

St. Stephen Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

St. Stephen Middle School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Timberland High School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CALHOUN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Bethlehem Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

John Ford Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

St. John Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Chicora Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Haut Gap Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Hunley Park Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Jane Edwards Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Malcolm C. Hursey Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Matilda F. Durston Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Midland Park Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Mt. Zion Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

North Charleston Elementary School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

North Charleston High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Pepperhill Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Ronald E. McNair Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

W. B. Goodwin Elementary School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Gaffney Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Gaffney Sr. High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

John E. Ewing Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CHESTER COUNTY SCHOOLS

Chester Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Chester Sr. High School did not respond to the survey.

Great Falls Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Lewisville Middle School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

CLARENDON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Manning Jr. High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

COLLETON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Bells Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Black Street Elementary School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Colleton Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Forest Circle Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Forest Hills Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Hampton Street Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Ivenia Brown Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Northside Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Smoaks Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Walterboro High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

DARLINGTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Brunson-Dargan Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Darlington Jr. High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Hartsville Jr. High School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

J. L. Cain Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Lamar Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Lamar High School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Rosenwald/St. David's Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Thornwell Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Washington Street Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

DILLON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Lake View High School did not respond to the survey.

Lake View Middle School did not respond to the survey.

DILLON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Gordon Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

DORCHESTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Harleyville-Ridgeville Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

St. George Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

EDGEFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Douglas Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Johnson-Edgefield-Trenton Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Fairfield Primary School reported six activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Kelly Miller Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

FLORENCE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Dewey Carter Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

North Vista Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Southside Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Williams Middle School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

FLORENCE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

J. Paul Truluck Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Olanta Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Ronald E. McNair Jr. High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

GEORGETOWN COUNTY SCHOOLS

J. B. Beck Middle (Georgetown Middle) School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Rosemary Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Sampit Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Alexander Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Berea Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Carolina High School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Greer Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Grove Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Sans Souci Intermediate School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Sirrine Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Southside High School did not respond to the survey.

Woodmont High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Woodmont Middle School did not respond to the survey.

GREENWOOD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 51

Ware Shoals High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS

Loris Middle School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

KERSHAW COUNTY SCHOOLS

North Central High School did not respond to the survey.

Pine Tree Hill Elementary provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOLS

Barr Street Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Buford Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Clinton Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Kershaw Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Lancaster High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

South Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

LAURENS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 56

Bell Street Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Joanna-Woodson Elementary School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Martha Dendy Sixth Grade Center reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

LEXINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Sandhills Middle School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Johnakin Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Marion Intermediate School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Palmetto Elementary School reported four activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Palmetto School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7

Brittons Neck Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Brittons Neck High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

MARLBORO

Bennettsville Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Blenheim Elementary/Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Wallace Elementary/Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

NEWBERRY

Boundary Street Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Newberry High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Whitmire High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

OCONEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Tamassee-Salem High School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Tamassee-Salem Middle School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ORANGEBURG CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Holly Hill Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ORANGEBURG CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Carver-Edisto Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Hunter-Kinard-Tyler Elementary School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Hunter-Kinard-Tyler High School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 5

Bowman Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Mellichamp Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

North Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Orangeburg-Wilkinson Sr. High School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Rivelon Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Sheridan Elementary School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

William J. Clark Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Annie Burnside Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Burton/Virginia Pack Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Hopkins Elementary School did not respond to the survey.

Hopkins Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Hyatt Park Elementary School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Lower Richland High School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Southeast Middle School did not respond to the survey.

St. Andrews Middle School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Webber Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

W. G. Sanders Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

W. J. Keenan High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SALUDA COUNTY SCHOOLS

Saluda Elementary School provided no activities on which to evaluate the use of the Retraining Grant funds.

Saluda Middle School did not respond to the survey.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6

Fairforest Middle School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7

Carver Jr. High School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Mary H. Wright Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Park Hills Elementary School reported two activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

W. Herbert Chapman Elementary School reported three activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Z. L. Madden Elementary School reported one activity that was conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

SUMTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Furman Middle School reported seven activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

UNION COUNTY SCHOOLS

Excelsior Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Jonesville Elementary School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Sims Jr. High School did not respond to the survey.

WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SCHOOLS

Chavis Middle School did not respond to the survey.

Kingstree Elementary School reported five activities that were conducted during the 2001-02 school year or planned for the 2002-03 school year.

Kingstree Jr. High School did not respond to the survey.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implementation of the Retraining Grant Program with a large number of schools has presented several challenges. The fiscal timeline for the Retraining Grant Program, especially the first year a school receives a grant, is difficult to match with the development of a School Renewal Plan and the implementation of the professional development program at the school. Providing the training necessary to develop a sound School Renewal Plan is imperative if changes are to be made in instruction at schools where student achievement and instructional practices have fallen short of desired goals in the past. Getting principals to attend the training sessions provided by the Office of School Quality and to respond to the survey needed by the Division of Accountability remain difficult.

Because it takes time to implement long-lasting change in a school, it is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities conducted by the schools new to the Retraining Grant Program. The effectiveness of the activities will become more evident over the next year or two.

Effectiveness of the Retraining Grant Program at the 24 schools that have had the program for more than one year is hampered by the constant turnover in the administration at those schools, which prevents continuity in instructional focus. The large turnover in the teaching staff further hampers the effectiveness of the Program as institutionalization of better instructional practices is limited by having to constantly train new teachers in the activities. Both the administration and teaching staff must become more stable at these schools for institutionalization, and therefore, long lasting change to occur.

The positive aspects of the Retraining Grant Program are:

- A specific planning program for implementation of the Retraining Grant Program is available from the Office of School Quality at SDE.
- Principals state that teachers benefit from the Program and use what they learn through the Program in the classroom.
- Faculty are involved in the planning process.
- School board members and superintendents are supportive of the Retraining Grant activities conducted at the schools.
- Professional development was scheduled to minimize teacher absences from the classroom.
- Professional development activities chosen by the schools were based on research.

Areas of concern with the Retraining Grant Program are:

- Many activities took place without an administrator present.
- Procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities conducted through the Retraining Grant Program are not defined at the school level.
- Activities were not evaluated for effectiveness throughout the year.
- Schools did not take advantage of the pre-approved activities identified by the Office of School Quality.
- Schools continue to not participate in the survey conducted by the Division of Accountability.
- Schools were unable to spend the allotted funds during fiscal year 2002.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Schools that have been active in the Retraining Grant Program for the past four years that did not respond to the survey conducted by the Division of Accountability should not receive additional funding in fiscal year 2003.

2. The State Board of Education should consider adding to the Guidelines for the Retraining Grant Program a statement requiring participating schools to respond to the survey conducted by the Division of Accountability or risk loss of Retraining Grant funds in future years.
3. The State Department of Education should study the feasibility of providing funding to first year Retraining Grant schools solely for the purpose of developing a strong School Renewal Plan with specific professional development activities.
4. School principals should be required to attend the planning process workshops offered by the Office of School Quality prior to release of funding. Individual principals could opt out of the training upon providing the Office of School Quality with acceptable evidence that the principal already has the desired skills and knowledge needed to develop a strong School Renewal Plan.
5. The procedures for the disbursement of funds should be reviewed by the State Department of Education to determine the feasibility of releasing all of the funds at once, as was done in the past, in order to facilitate the procurement process at the local school district.