

Pursuant to Court's Instructions the Record on Appeal in this matter was condensed. Pages were not renumbered, therefore it appears there are missing pages, however, counsel has confirmed all pertinent information is included in the condensed record.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM LEE COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Thomas W Cooper, Jr , Circuit Court Judge

Case No 93-CP-31-169

Abbeville County School District, Allendale County School District, Bamberg County School District 1, Bamberg County School District 2, Barnwell County School District 19, Barnwell County School District 29, Barnwell County School District 45, Berkeley County School District, Chesterfield County School District, Clarendon County School District 1, Clarendon County School District 2, Clarendon County School District 3, Dillon County School District 1, Dillon County School District 2, Dillon County School District 3, Florence County School District 1, Florence County School District 2, Florence County School District 3, Florence County School District 4, Florence County School District 5, Hampton County School District 1, Hampton County School District 2, Jasper County School District, Laurens County School District 55, Laurens County School District 56, Lee County School District, Lexington County School District 4, Marion County School District 1, Marion County School District 2, Marion County School District 7, Marlboro County School District, McCormick County School District, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 3, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5, Saluda County School District and Williamsburg County School District, *(caption continued on second page)*

**RECORD ON APPEAL (CONDENSED),
VOL. XXI OF XXVIII**

Lena Manning, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Allendale County and as Guardian ad Litem of Courtney V , Courtney V , a minor, by and through Lena Manning, as Guardian ad Litem, William L Mills, individually, and as a Taxpayer residing in Allendale County and as Guardian ad Litem of Waylon P , Waylon P , a minor, by and through William Mills, as Guardian ad Litem, Betty Bagley, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Bamberg County and as a parent and Guardian ad Litem of Tyler B , Tyler B , a minor, by and through Betty Bagley, as Guardian ad Litem, Evert Comer, Jr , individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Bamberg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Kimberly C , Kimberly C , a minor, by and through Evert Comer, Jr , as Guardian ad Litem, Marla Q Jameson, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Barnwell County, and as a parent and Guardian ad Litem of Eleanor J , Eleanor J , a minor, by and through Marla Q Jameson, as Guardian ad Litem, Victor M Lancaster, Sr , individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Barnwell County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Christie L , Christie L , a minor, by and through Victor M Lancaster, Sr , as Guardian ad Litem, Dr Charles Clark, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Chesterfield County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Candace C , a minor, by and through Dr Charles Clark, as Guardian ad Litem, Colonel Larry Coker, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Clarendon County, and as a parent and Guardian ad Litem of Corrie C , Corrie C , a minor, by and through Colonel Larry Coker, as Guardian ad Litem, Pamela Williams, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Dillon County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Kathisha W , Kathisha W , a minor, by and through Pamela Williams as Guardian ad Litem, Eddie Wright, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Florence County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Brandon F , Brandon F , a minor, by and through Eddie Wright as Guardian ad Litem, John Whiteside, individually, and as a

taxpayer residing in Florence County and as Parent and Guardian ad Litem of Joel W , Joel W , a minor, by and through John Whiteside as Guardian ad Litem, Dr Francis Mills, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Hampton County and as a parent and Guardian ad Litem of Amy M , Amy M , a minor, by and through Dr Francis Mills, as Guardian ad Litem, Brenda Brooks, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Hampton County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Tyrin B , Tyrin B , a minor, by and through Brenda Brooks as Guardian ad Litem, Marva Tigner, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Jasper County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Bryan T and Bradley T , Bryan T , a minor, by and through Marva Tigner as Guardian ad Litem, Bradley T , a minor, by and through Marva Tigner as Guardian ad Litem, Robert Elisha Short, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Laurens County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Robert B S , Robert B S , a minor, by and through Robert Elisha Short, as Guardian ad Litem, Dr Keith A Bridges, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Laurens County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Jorgana Ranson B , Jorgana Ranson B , a minor, by and through Dr Keith A Bridges, as Guardian ad Litem, Gail Y Harriott, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Lee County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Rashade H , Rashade H , a minor, by and through Gail Y Harriott, as Guardian ad Litem, Linda Carraway, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Marion County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Kimberly W , Kimberly W , a minor, by and through Linda Carraway as Guardian ad Litem, Dr John Nobles, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Marlboro County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Erin N , Erin N , a minor, by and through Dr John Nobles, as Guardian ad Litem, Patricia Hampton, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in McCormick County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Krystle H ,

Krystle H , a minor, by and through Patricia Hampton, as Guardian ad Litem, Bernice Profit, individually, as a taxpayer residing in Orangeburg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Russell H , Russell H , a minor, by and through Bernice Profit, as Guardian ad Litem, Matlin P Brown, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Orangeburg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Tanisha P B , Tanisha P B , a minor, by and through Matlin P Brown, as Guardian ad Litem, James Berry, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Orangeburg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Dondrea B , Dondrea B , a minor, by and through James Berry, as Guardian ad Litem, Gerald Smith, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Orangeburg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Brenda S , Brenda S , a minor, by and through Gerald Smith, as Guardian ad Litem, Thomas Shealy, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Saluda County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Thomas S , Jr , Thomas S , Jr , a minor, by and through Thomas Shealy, as Guardian ad Litem,

Of whom

Allendale County School District,
Dillon County School District 2,
Florence County School District 4,
Hampton County School District 2,
Jasper County School District,
Lee County School District,
Marion County School District 7,
Orangeburg School District 3,
Lena Manning, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Allendale County and as Guardian ad Litem of Courtney V , Courtney V , a minor, by and through Lena Manning, as Guardian ad Litem, Pamela Williams, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Dillon County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Katisha W , Katisha W , a minor, by and through Pamela Williams as

Plaintiffs,

Guardian ad Litem, Eddie Wright, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Florence County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Brandon F , Brandon F , a minor, by and through Eddie Wright as Guardian ad Litem, Brenda Brooks, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Hampton County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Tyrin B , Tyrin B , a minor, by and through Brenda Brooks as Guardian ad Litem, Marva Tigner, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Jasper County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Bryan T and Bradley T , Bryan T , a minor, by and through Marva Tigner as Guardian ad Litem, Bradley T , a minor, by and through Marva Tigner as Guardian ad Litem, Gail Y Harriott, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Lee County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Rashade H , Rashade H , a minor, by and through Gail Y Harriott, as Guardian ad Litem, Linda Carraway, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Marion County, and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Kimberly W , Kimberly W , a minor, by and through Linda Carraway as Guardian ad Litem, Bernice Profit, individually, and as a taxpayer residing in Orangeburg County and as parent and Guardian ad Litem of Russell H , Russell H , a minor, by and through Bernice Profit, as Guardian ad Litem, are

Appellants-
Respondents,

v

Glenn F McConnell, as President *Pro Tempore* of the Senate and as a representative of the South Carolina Senate, Robert W Harrell, Jr , as Speaker of the House of Representatives and as a representative of the South Carolina House of Representatives,

Respondents-
Appellants,

and

The State of South Carolina, Mark C Sanford, as Governor of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP

Carl B Epps, III

Stephen G Morrison
Laura Callaway Hart
Shelby K Leonardi
Elizabeth Scott Moise
Rachel Atkin Hedley
D Kay Tennyson
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000

Attorneys for Appellants-Respondents

SOWELL, GRAY, STEPP AND LAFITTE, L L C

Robert E Stepp
Elizabeth Van Doren
A Jackson Barnes
Roland M Franklin, Jr
1310 Gadsden Street
Post Office Box 11449
Columbia, Sc 29211
(803) 929-1400

**Attorneys for Respondents / Appellants Glenn F
McConnell and Robert William Harrell, Jr**

J Emory Smith, Jr
Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211-1549
(803) 734-3680

Attorney for the State

Swati S Patel
Office of the Governor
P O Box 12267
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-5251

Attorney for the Governor

**TABLE 81
PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE MALE, 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically				
Full-Time Equivalency of Teachers				
District	Total	Male	Percent Male	Rank
Abbeville	274.6	52.0	18.9	20
Aiken	1 531.9	238.4	15.6	59
Allendale	158.4	37.0	23.4	6
Anderson 1	444.4	63.9	14.4	75
Anderson 2	212.6	31.0	14.6	72
Anderson 3	163.4	27.5	16.8	44
Anderson 4	179.2	43.0	24.0	5
Anderson 5	784.0	122.0	16.0	53
Bamberg 1	125.8	24.6	19.5	15
Bamberg 2	94.0	21.0	22.3	8
Barnwell 19	75.7	15.7	20.7	12
Barnwell 29	72.0	9.0	12.5	85
Barnwell 45	184.7	27.0	14.6	72
Beaufort	1 203.9	217.9	18.1	27
Berkeley	1 739.2	300.7	17.3	39
Calhoun	153.8	19.4	12.6	84
Charleston	3 003.0	505.1	16.8	44
Cherokee	606.5	112.5	18.5	23
Chester	478.2	85.0	17.8	32
Chesterfield	531.5	98.0	18.4	24
Clarendon 1	99.5	17.5	17.6	37
Clarendon 2	206.0	29.0	14.1	78
Clarendon 3	82.8	16.4	19.8	14
Colleton	443.3	78.3	17.7	34
Darlington	829.8	124.8	15.0	66
Dillon 1	59.2	18.3	30.9	1
Dillon 2	223.5	42.8	19.1	18
Dillon 3	86.5	14.3	16.5	47
Dorchester 2	1 070.0	165.0	15.4	63
Dorchester 4	177.8	31.8	17.9	31
Edgefield	284.0	40.0	14.1	78
Fairfield	282.6	63.4	22.4	7
Florence 1	971.5	134.0	13.8	81
Florence 2	79.2	11.9	15.0	68
Florence 3	284.7	43.2	15.2	64
Florence 4	87.4	17.0	19.5	15
Florence 5	99.3	14.6	14.7	70
Georgetown	779.5	120.7	15.5	60
Greenville	3 979.2	600.5	15.1	65
Greenwood 50	613.3	81.0	13.2	83
Greenwood 51	85.5	14.0	16.4	48
Greenwood 52	106.0	20.0	18.9	20
Hampton 1	193.7	35.0	18.1	27
Hampton 2	107.0	31.0	29.0	2

TABLE 81 (Continued)
 PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE MALE, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
Full-Time Equivalency of Teachers				
District	Total	Male	Percent Male	Rank
Horry	1 899.4	380.3	18.0	30
Jasper	191.5	42.5	22.2	9
Kershaw	615.5	101.0	16.4	48
Lancaster	733.5	118.0	16.1	50
Laurens 55	402.8	64.9	16.1	50
Laurens 56	235.4	33.8	14.4	75
Lee	227.7	55.0	24.2	4
Lexington 1	1,266.7	202.0	15.9	54
Lexington 2	688.1	112.9	16.9	43
Lexington 3	155.2	28.2	18.2	25
Lexington 4	216.0	32.0	14.8	69
Lexington 5	1,067.6	157.1	14.7	70
McCormick	83.0	22.0	26.5	3
Marion 1	214.4	30.6	14.3	77
Marion 2	143.0	24.0	16.8	44
Marion 7	78.3	15.0	19.2	17
Marlboro	334.5	61.0	18.2	25
Newberry	448.8	78.4	17.5	38
Oconee	757.1	152.7	20.2	13
Orangeburg 3	282.8	50.2	19.1	18
Orangeburg 4	281.9	44.8	15.8	55
Orangeburg 5	529.5	91.0	17.2	41
Pickens	1,058.8	187.9	17.7	34
Richland 1	2 050.7	383.2	17.7	34
Richland 2	1,212.1	216.1	17.8	32
Saluda	166.1	30.1	18.1	27
Spartanburg 1	313.7	53.4	17.0	42
Spartanburg 2	472.6	64.8	13.7	82
Spartanburg 3	219.8	38.0	17.3	39
Spartanburg 4	176.3	28.4	16.1	50
Spartanburg 5	417.7	68.0	15.8	55
Spartanburg 6	621.0	98.0	15.8	55
Spartanburg 7	691.2	101.1	14.6	72
Sumter 2	610.5	114.0	18.7	22
Sumter 17	619.1	97.7	15.8	55
Union	379.7	80.0	21.1	11
Williamsburg	397.8	65.5	21.5	10
York 1	336.5	47.0	14.0	80
York 2	386.8	57.0	15.5	60
York 3	968.9	150.2	15.5	60
York 4	371.8	55.8	15.0	66
State Totals	45,591.5	7 826.5	16.7	
District Median			16.9	

TABLE 81 (Continued)
 PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE MALE, 2001-02
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
Full-Time Equivalency of Teachers				
District	Total	Male	Percent Male	Rank
Dillon 1	59.2	18.3	30.9	1
Hampton 2	107.0	31.0	29.0	2
McCormick	83.0	22.0	26.5	3
Lee	227.7	55.0	24.2	4
Anderson 4	179.2	43.0	24.0	5
Allendale	158.4	37.0	23.4	6
Fairfield	282.8	63.4	22.4	7
Bamberg 2	94.0	21.0	22.3	8
Jasper	191.5	42.5	22.2	9
Williamsburg	397.6	85.5	21.5	10
Union	379.7	80.0	21.1	11
Barnwell 19	75.7	15.7	20.7	12
Oconee	757.1	152.7	20.2	13
Clarendon 3	82.8	16.4	19.8	14
Bamberg 1	125.8	24.5	19.5	15
Florence 4	87.4	17.0	19.5	15
Marion 7	78.3	15.0	19.2	17
Dillon 2	223.5	42.8	19.1	18
Orangeburg 3	282.8	50.2	19.1	18
Abbeville	274.6	52.0	18.9	20
Greenwood 52	106.0	20.0	18.9	20
Sumter 2	610.5	114.0	18.7	22
Cherokee	606.5	112.5	18.5	23
Chesterfield	531.5	98.0	18.4	24
Lexington 3	155.2	28.2	18.2	25
Marlboro	334.5	61.0	18.2	25
Beaufort	1,203.9	217.9	18.1	27
Hampton 1	193.7	35.0	18.1	27
Saluda	166.1	30.1	18.1	27
Horry	1,999.4	360.3	18.0	30
Dorchester 4	177.8	31.8	17.9	31
Chester	478.2	85.0	17.8	32
Richland 2	1,212.1	216.1	17.8	32
Colleton	443.3	78.3	17.7	34
Pickens	1,058.8	187.9	17.7	34
Richland 1	2,050.7	363.2	17.7	34
Clarendon 1	99.5	17.5	17.6	37
Newberry	448.8	78.4	17.5	38
Berkeley	1,739.2	300.7	17.3	39
Spartanburg 3	219.6	38.0	17.3	39
Orangeburg 5	529.5	91.0	17.2	41
Spartanburg 1	313.7	53.4	17.0	42
Lexington 2	668.1	112.9	16.9	43
Anderson 3	163.4	27.5	16.8	44

TABLE 81 (Continued)
 PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE MALE, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
Full-Time Equivalency of Teachers				
District	Total	Male	Percent Male	Rank
Charleston	3,003.0	505.1	16.8	44
Marion 2	143.0	24.0	16.8	44
Dillon 3	88.5	14.3	16.5	47
Greenwood 51	85.5	14.0	16.4	48
Kershaw	615.5	101.0	16.4	48
Lancaster	733.5	118.0	16.1	60
Laurens 55	402.8	64.9	16.1	50
Spartanburg 4	176.3	28.4	16.1	50
Anderson 5	784.0	122.0	16.0	53
Lexington 1	1,268.7	202.0	15.9	54
Orangeburg 4	281.9	44.6	15.8	55
Spartanburg 5	417.7	66.0	15.8	55
Spartanburg 6	621.0	98.0	15.8	55
Sumter 17	619.1	97.7	15.8	55
Aiken	1,531.9	238.4	15.6	59
Georgetown	779.5	120.7	15.5	60
York 2	366.8	57.0	15.5	60
York 3	968.9	150.2	15.5	60
Dorchester 2	1,070.0	165.0	15.4	63
Florence 3	284.7	43.2	15.2	64
Greenville	3,979.2	600.5	15.1	65
Darlington	829.8	124.8	15.0	66
Florence 2	79.2	11.9	15.0	66
York 4	371.8	55.8	15.0	66
Lexington 4	216.0	32.0	14.8	69
Florence 5	99.3	14.6	14.7	70
Lexington 5	1,067.6	157.1	14.7	70
Anderson 2	212.6	31.0	14.6	72
Barnwell 45	184.7	27.0	14.6	72
Spartanburg 7	691.2	101.1	14.6	72
Anderson 1	444.4	63.9	14.4	75
Laurens 56	235.4	33.8	14.4	75
Marion 1	214.4	30.8	14.3	77
Clarendon 2	206.0	29.0	14.1	78
Edgefield	284.0	40.0	14.1	78
York 1	336.5	47.0	14.0	80
Florence 1	971.5	134.0	13.8	81
Spartanburg 2	472.6	64.8	13.7	82
Greenwood 50	613.3	81.0	13.2	83
Calhoun	153.8	19.4	12.6	84
Barnwell 29	72.0	9.0	12.5	85
State Totals	48,591.5	7,626.5	16.7	
District Median			16.9	

See "References for Tables"

TABLE 82
TEACHER TURNOVER RATE FROM 2000-01 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Percent	Rank	District	Percent	Rank
Abbeville	11.3	57	Horry	11.5	56
Aiken	12.0	49	Jasper	20.8	8
Alendale	25.4	4	Kershaw	9.9	67
Anderson 1	12.5	43	Lancaster	10.2	62
Anderson 2	9.2	70	Laurens 55	17.3	16
Anderson 3	24.8	6	Laurens 56	12.2	45
Anderson 4	12.1	47	Lee	24.4	6
Anderson 5	13.0	34	Lexington 1	8.2	76
Bamberg 1	5.7	83	Lexington 2	19.2	11
Bamberg 2	26.3	2	Lexington 3	10.1	68
Barnwell 19	17.1	17	Lexington 4	20.5	9
Barnwell 29	10.6	60	Lexington 5	12.5	43
Barnwell 45	4.4	84	McCormick	31.2	1
Beaufort	12.1	47	Marion 1	10.2	62
Berkeley	13.5	29	Marion 2	8.6	75
Calhoun	4.4	84	Manor 7	17.4	15
Charleston	16.0	21	Marlboro	12.8	37
Cherokee	10.4	61	Newberry	16.4	19
Chester	9.9	67	Oconee	11.6	54
Chesterfield	9.0	72	Orangeburg 3	12.8	37
Clarendon 1	18.8	13	Orangeburg 4	11.6	54
Clarendon 2	16.2	20	Orangeburg 5	14.9	24
Clarendon 3	6.8	82	Pickens	7.3	80
Colleton	12.2	45	Richland 1	19.0	12
Darlington	13.5	29	Richland 2	13.6	28
Dillon 1	7.8	78	Saluda	22.5	7
Dillon 2	7.7	79	Spartanburg 1	11.8	51
Dillon 3	13.3	33	Spartanburg 2	8.8	73
Dorchester 2	14.8	26	Spartanburg 3	13.5	29
Dorchester 4	13.9	27	Spartanburg 4	9.9	67
Edgefield	7.2	81	Spartanburg 5	10.7	59
Fairfield	16.9	18	Spartanburg 6	12.8	37
Florence 1	12.7	40	Spartanburg 7	8.2	76
Florence 2	9.2	70	Sumter 2	12.8	42
Florence 3	15.6	22	Sumter 17	14.9	24
Florence 4	26.1	3	Union	8.8	73
Florence 5	17.8	14	Williamsburg	15.4	23
Georgetown	13.0	34	York 1	11.1	58
Greenville	13.4	32	York 2	12.0	49
Greenwood 50	11.8	51	York 3	12.7	40
Greenwood 51	19.3	10	York 4	10.2	62
Greenwood 52	10.2	62	State Total	10.4	
Hampton 1	11.8	51	District Median	12.5	
Hampton 2	12.9	38			

TABLE 82 (Continued)
TEACHER TURNOVER RATE FROM 2000-01 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Percent	Rank	District	Percent	Rank
McCormick	31.2	1	Colleton	12.2	45
Bamberg 2	26.3	2	Laurens 56	12.2	45
Florence 4	26.1	3	Anderson 4	12.1	47
Allendale	25.4	4	Beaufort	12.1	47
Anderson 3	24.8	5	Alken	12.0	49
Lee	24.4	6	York 2	12.0	49
Saluda	22.5	7	Greenwood 50	11.8	51
Jasper	20.8	8	Hampton 1	11.8	51
Lexington 4	20.5	9	Spartanburg 1	11.8	51
Greenwood 51	19.3	10	Oconee	11.6	54
Lexington 2	19.2	11	Orangeburg 4	11.6	54
Richland 1	19.0	12	Horry	11.5	56
Clarendon 1	18.8	13	Abbeville	11.3	57
Florence 5	17.8	14	York 1	11.1	58
Marion 7	17.4	15	Spartanburg 5	10.7	59
Laurens 55	17.3	16	Barnwell 29	10.6	60
Barnwell 19	17.1	17	Cherokee	10.4	61
Fairfield	16.9	18	Greenwood 52	10.2	62
Newberry	16.4	19	Lancaster	10.2	62
Clarendon 2	16.2	20	Marion 1	10.2	62
Charleston	16.0	21	York 4	10.2	62
Florence 3	15.8	22	Lexington 3	10.1	66
Williamsburg	15.4	23	Chester	9.9	67
Orangeburg 5	14.9	24	Kershaw	9.9	67
Sumter 17	14.8	24	Spartanburg 4	9.9	67
Dorchester 2	14.8	26	Anderson 2	9.2	70
Dorchester 4	13.9	27	Florence 2	9.2	70
Richland 2	13.6	28	Chesterfield	9.0	72
Berkeley	13.5	29	Spartanburg 2	8.8	73
Darlington	13.5	29	Union	8.8	73
Spartanburg 3	13.5	29	Marion 2	8.6	75
Greenville	13.4	32	Lexington 1	8.2	76
Dillon 3	13.3	33	Spartanburg 7	8.2	76
Anderson 5	13.0	34	Dillon 1	7.8	78
Georgetown	13.0	34	Dillon 2	7.7	79
Hampton 2	12.9	36	Pickens	7.3	80
Marlboro	12.8	37	Edgefield	7.2	81
Orangeburg 3	12.8	37	Clarendon 3	6.6	82
Spartanburg 6	12.8	37	Bamberg 1	5.7	83
Florence 1	12.7	40	Barnwell 45	4.4	84
York 3	12.7	40	Calhoun	4.4	84
Sumter 2	12.6	42	State Total	10.4	
Anderson 1	12.5	43	District Median	12.5	
Lexington 5	12.5	43			

See References for Tables "

S E C T I O N

5

FINANCES

State funds for fringe benefits have been issued directly to the school districts since 1987-88 rather than being held at the State Department of Education as in prior years. This funding procedure was also followed for the 1981-82 school year. Consequently, the total fringe benefits are now included in the operating funds of the school districts.

The pupil count used in the computation of expenditures and revenues per pupil is the 135-day average daily membership for kindergarten through grade twelve.

Table 99 reflects the fiscal capacity as updated annually by the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation. The fiscal capacity shown for each district in this table is determined by the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation and is the sum of five different parts or types of fiscal capacity.

Part 1 is the adjusted assessed value of all owner-occupied residential property which is 4 percent of the full market value

Part 2 is the assessed value of agricultural property as determined through applying a 4 percent or 6 percent assessment ratio according to use

Part 3 is the adjusted assessed value of all the other real property such as commercial property rental homes vacation homes and so on, with the assessment rate set at 6 percent of the full market value

Part 4 is the total assessed value of all the locally assessed personal property such as personal automobiles boats airplanes and so on

Part 5 is the total assessed value of property under the jurisdiction of the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation. The types of property included in part 5 are utilities inventory lock-in fees in lieu of tax payments manufacturers and business personal property carlines airlines railroads pipelines and so on

Adjusted assessed value, referenced above in parts 1 and 3 is determined annually by the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation. The assessed value is adjusted for each district to reflect fair market value as determined by a sale-appraisal ratio study involving sales data for the two most current years. The sum of these five fiscal capacity parts for any given school district divided by the derived fiscal capacity for the state produces the index of taxpaying ability commonly referred to as the "ability index" for a given district (see table 102)

The funding index used by the South Carolina Department of Education is presented again this year in Table 103. This index used in conjunction with the base student cost and the weighted membership determines the funding under the Education Finance Act. The funding index for 2001-02 is based on property values as of December 31, 1998.

The ability index calculated by the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation is based on property values as of December 31, 2001. Tax effort for 2001-02 is presented in Table 102 along with the ability index.

Current operating expenditures reported in this publication (tables 88 and 104) include the totals for district and school leadership, instruction and instructional support, building upkeep and maintenance, pupil food services, transportation safety and business services. Expenditures for capital projects and debt service (tables 115 and 116) are not included in the tables reflecting current operating expenditures.

See Appendix A for a complete listing of school district audit accounts used in the computation of revenues and InSite™ categories used in the computation of expenditures.

**TABLE 83
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE
AND ZERO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Abbeville	\$26,684	51	Hampton 2	\$26,947	39
Aiken	30,017	1	Horry	27,377	33
Allendale	25,784	72	Jasper	26,887	45
Anderson 1	27,828	17	Kershaw	26,934	41
Anderson 2	27,325	36	Lancaster	27,199	38
Anderson 3	27,514	31	Laurens 55	27,353	35
Anderson 4	27,702	22	Laurens 56	26,882	44
Anderson 5	28,043	12	Lee	25,484	79
Bamberg 1	25,939	70	Lexington 1	27,420	32
Bamberg 2	26,084	68	Lexington 2	27,739	19
Barnwell 19	25,184	82	Lexington 3	26,500	58
Barnwell 29	26,443	58	Lexington 4	26,695	49
Barnwell 45	27,702	22	Lexington 5	27,954	15
Beaufort	28,604	2	McCormick	26,384	59
Berkeley	26,596	53	Marion 1	26,034	68
Calhoun	26,947	39	Marion 2	25,684	78
Charleston	26,793	46	Marion 7	25,484	79
Cherokee	27,610	25	Marlboro	26,184	63
Chester	27,576	29	Newberry	26,669	54
Chesterfield	26,443	56	Oconee	27,725	20
Clarendon 1	25,684	71	Orangeburg 3	27,610	25
Clarendon 2	26,784	72	Orangeburg 4	27,610	25
Clarendon 3	25,384	81	Orangeburg 5	27,610	25
Colleton	22,685	77	Pickens	27,375	34
Dartington	23,358	52	Richland 1	27,777	18
Dillon 1	22,255	82	Richland 2	28,024	14
Dillon 2	22,255	82	Saluda	25,782	74
Dillon 3	22,255	82	Spartanburg 1	28,206	5
Dorchester 2	23,803	48	Spartanburg 2	28,206	5
Dorchester 4	23,604	47	Spartanburg 3	28,206	5
Edgefield	24,005	41	Spartanburg 4	28,206	5
Fairfield	24,036	30	Spartanburg 5	28,206	5
Florence 1	22,505	61	Spartanburg 6	28,206	5
Florence 2	22,630	78	Spartanburg 7	28,206	5
Florence 3	22,758	49	Sumter 2	26,084	68
Florence 4	22,265	58	Sumter 17	26,191	62
Florence 5	23,005	68	Union	26,888	43
Georgetown	23,420	60	Williamsburg	25,688	75
Greenville	24,059	21	York 1	27,702	22
Greenwood 50	23,821	37	York 2	26,458	3
Greenwood 51	22,455	63	York 3	26,362	4
Greenwood 52	23,811	13	York 4	27,691	16
Hampton 1	26,184	63	State Minimum	\$25,184	
			District Median	\$26,684	

**TABLE 83 (Continued)
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE
AND ZERO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Ranked Numerically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Alkon	\$30,017	1	Laurens 58	\$26,882	44
Beaufort	28,604	2	Jasper	26,887	45
York 2	28,458	3	Charleston	26,793	46
York 3	28,362	4	Dorchester 4	23,804	47
Spartanburg 1	28,208	5	Dorchester 2	23,803	48
Spartanburg 2	28,206	5	Florence 3	22,756	49
Spartanburg 3	28,208	5	Lexington 4	26,695	49
Spartanburg 4	28,206	5	Abbeville	26,684	51
Spartanburg 5	28,206	5	Darlington	23,358	52
Spartanburg 6	28,206	5	Berkeley	26,596	53
Spartanburg 7	28,206	5	Newberry	26,589	54
Anderson 5	28,043	12	Lexington 3	26,500	55
Greenwood 52	23,811	13	Barnwell 29	26,443	56
Richland 2	28,024	14	Chesterfield	26,443	56
Lexington 5	27,954	15	Florence 4	22,255	58
York 4	27,891	16	McCormick	26,384	59
Anderson 1	27,828	17	Georgetown	23,420	60
Richland 1	27,777	18	Florence 1	22,506	61
Lexington 2	27,739	19	Sumter 17	26,191	62
Oconee	27,725	20	Greenwood 51	22,455	63
Greenville	24,059	21	Hampton 1	26,184	63
Anderson 4	27,702	22	Marlboro	26,184	63
Barnwell 46	27,702	22	Bamberg 2	26,084	66
York 1	27,702	22	Sumter 2	26,084	66
Cherokee	27,610	25	Florence 5	23,005	68
Orangeburg 3	27,610	25	Marion 1	26,034	68
Orangeburg 4	27,610	25	Bamberg 1	25,939	70
Orangeburg 5	27,610	25	Clarendon 1	25,884	71
Chester	27,576	29	Abbeville	25,784	72
Fairfield	24,035	30	Clarendon 2	26,784	72
Anderson 3	27,514	31	Saluda	25,782	74
Lexington 1	27,420	32	Williamsburg	25,888	75
Horry	27,377	33	Marion 2	25,684	78
Pickens	27,375	34	Colleton	22,685	77
Laurens 55	27,353	35	Florence 2	22,630	78
Anderson 2	27,325	36	Lee	25,484	79
Greenwood 50	23,821	37	Marion 7	25,484	79
Lancaster	27,199	38	Clarendon 3	25,384	81
Calhoun	26,947	39	Barnwell 19	25,184	82
Hampton 2	26,947	39	Dillon 1	22,255	82
Edgefield	24,005	41	Dillon 2	22,255	82
Kershaw	26,934	41	Dillon 3	22,255	82
Union	26,888	43	State Minimum	\$25,184	
			District Median	\$26,884	

*See *References for Tables

TABLE 84
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A MASTER'S DEGREE
AND ZERO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Abbeville	\$30,336	54	Hampton 2	\$30,855	38
Alken	34,560	1	Horry	31,346	34
Allendale	29,436	74	Jasper	30,691	43
Anderson 1	31,864	17	Kershaw	30,838	40
Anderson 2	31,287	35	Lancaster	31,143	37
Anderson 3	31,503	33	Laurens 55	31,283	36
Anderson 4	31,720	22	Laurens 56	30,780	42
Anderson 5	32,108	12	Lee	29,136	79
Barnberg 1	29,700	68	Lexington 1	31,781	19
Barnberg 2	29,736	67	Lexington 2	31,598	29
Barnwell 19	28,836	82	Lexington 3	30,153	57
Barnwell 29	30,278	55	Lexington 4	30,566	49
Barnwell 45	31,720	22	Lexington 5	32,008	15
Beaufort	32,752	2	McCormick	30,036	60
Berkeley	30,453	52	Marion 1	29,686	69
Calhoun	30,855	38	Marion 2	29,366	76
Charleston	30,679	44	Marion 7	29,136	79
Cherokee	31,613	28	Marlboro	29,836	64
Chester	31,575	30	Newberry	30,422	53
Chesterfield	30,278	55	Oconee	31,745	20
Clarendon 1	29,636	71	Orangeburg 3	31,614	25
Clarendon 2	29,636	72	Orangeburg 4	31,614	25
Clarendon 3	29,036	81	Orangeburg 5	31,614	25
Colleton	29,328	77	Pickens	31,555	31
Darlington	30,480	51	Richland 1	31,804	18
Dillon 1	28,836	82	Richland 2	32,042	14
Dillon 2	28,836	82	Saluda	29,497	73
Dillon 3	28,836	82	Spartanburg 1	32,296	5
Dorchester 2	30,677	45	Spartanburg 2	32,296	5
Dorchester 4	30,677	45	Spartanburg 3	32,296	5
Edgefield	30,586	48	Spartanburg 4	32,296	5
Fairfield	31,518	32	Spartanburg 5	32,296	5
Florence 1	29,886	62	Spartanburg 6	32,296	5
Florence 2	29,261	78	Spartanburg 7	32,296	5
Florence 3	30,566	49	Sumter 2	29,866	63
Florence 4	30,081	59	Sumter 17	29,989	61
Florence 5	29,686	69	Union	30,613	47
Georgetown	30,149	58	Williamsburg	29,413	75
Greenville	31,739	21	York 1	31,720	22
Greenwood 50	30,806	41	York 2	32,586	3
Greenwood 51	29,836	64	York 3	32,475	4
Greenwood 52	32,087	13	York 4	31,838	16
Hampton 1	29,836	64	State Minimum	\$26,836	
			District Median	\$30,691	

TABLE 84 (Continued)
**SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A MASTER'S DEGREE
 AND ZERO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02***
 BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Aiken	\$34,560	1	Charleston	\$30,678	44
Beaufort	32,752	2	Dorchester 2	30,677	45
York 2	32,588	3	Dorchester 4	30,677	46
York 3	32,475	4	Union	30,613	47
Spartanburg 1	32,296	5	Edgefield	30,586	48
Spartanburg 2	32,296	5	Florence 3	30,566	49
Spartanburg 3	32,296	5	Lexington 4	30,566	49
Spartanburg 4	32,296	5	Darlington	30,480	51
Spartanburg 5	32,296	6	Berkeley	30,453	52
Spartanburg 6	32,296	5	Newberry	30,422	53
Spartanburg 7	32,296	5	Abbeville	30,338	54
Anderson 5	32,108	12	Barnwell 29	30,278	55
Greenwood 52	32,087	13	Chesterfield	30,278	55
Richland 2	32,042	14	Lexington 3	30,153	57
Lexington 5	32,008	15	Georgetown	30,149	58
York 4	31,938	16	Florence 4	30,081	59
Anderson 1	31,864	17	McCormick	30,038	60
Richland 1	31,804	18	Sumter 17	29,989	61
Lexington 1	31,781	19	Florence 1	29,886	62
Oconee	31,745	20	Sumter 2	29,866	63
Greenville	31,739	21	Greenwood 51	29,838	64
Anderson 4	31,720	22	Hampton 1	29,838	64
Barnwell 45	31,720	22	Marlboro	29,838	64
York 1	31,720	22	Bamberg 2	29,738	67
Orangeburg 3	31,614	25	Bamberg 1	29,700	68
Orangeburg 4	31,614	25	Florence 5	29,688	69
Orangeburg 5	31,614	25	Manon 1	29,688	69
Cherokee	31,613	28	Clarendon 1	29,638	71
Lexington 2	31,598	29	Clarendon 2	29,538	72
Chester	31,576	30	Saluda	29,497	73
Pickens	31,555	31	Allendale	29,438	74
Fairfield	31,518	32	Williamsburg	29,413	75
Anderson 3	31,503	33	Marion 2	29,368	76
Horry	31,348	34	Colleton	29,328	77
Anderson 2	31,287	35	Florence 2	29,261	78
Laurens 55	31,283	36	Lee	29,138	79
Lancaster	31,143	37	Marion 7	29,138	79
Calhoun	30,855	39	Clarendon 3	29,038	81
Hampton 2	30,855	39	Barnwell 19	28,838	82
Kershaw	30,838	40	Dillon 1	28,838	82
Greenwood 50	30,808	41	Dillon 2	28,838	82
Laurens 56	30,780	42	Dillon 3	28,838	82
Jasper	30,691	43	State Minimum	\$28,838	
			District Median	\$30,691	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 85
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE PLUS
EIGHTEEN HOURS AND TEN YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Abbeville	\$34,743	56	Hampton 2	\$35,571	37
Aiken	36,788	15	Horry	36,135	32
Allendale	33,843	74	Jasper	35,304	45
Anderson 1	36,734	16	Kershaw	35,555	39
Anderson 2	36,069	34	Lancaster	35,902	36
Anderson 3	36,318	29	Laurens 55	36,026	35
Anderson 4	36,567	20	Laurens 56	35,484	40
Anderson 5	37,016	11	Lee	33,543	79
Barnberg 1	34,240	66	Lexington 1	36,074	33
Barnberg 2	34,143	67	Lexington 2	36,177	30
Barnwell 19	33,243	82	Lexington 3	34,622	68
Barnwell 29	34,906	54	Lexington 4	35,238	46
Barnwell 45	36,567	20	Lexington 5	36,900	12
Beaufort	37,757	1	McCormick	34,442	60
Berkeley	35,106	50	Marion 1	34,093	68
Calhoun	35,570	38	Marion 2	33,743	76
Charleston	35,367	42	Marion 7	33,543	79
Cherokee	36,445	23	Marlboro	34,243	63
Chester	36,401	27	Newberry	35,071	51
Chesterfield	34,905	54	Oconee	36,598	18
Clarendon 1	33,993	71	Orangeburg 3	36,444	24
Clarendon 2	33,893	73	Orangeburg 4	36,444	24
Clarendon 3	33,443	81	Orangeburg 5	36,444	24
Colleton	33,812	75	Pickens	35,454	41
Darlington	35,138	48	Richland 1	36,665	17
Dillon 1	33,243	82	Richland 2	36,805	14
Dillon 2	33,243	82	Saluda	34,005	70
Dillon 3	33,243	82	Spartanburg 1	37,232	4
Dorchester 2	35,365	44	Spartanburg 2	37,232	4
Dorchester 4	35,366	43	Spartanburg 3	37,232	4
Edgefield	34,993	52	Spartanburg 4	37,232	4
Fairfield	36,335	28	Spartanburg 5	37,232	4
Florence 1	34,293	62	Spartanburg 6	37,232	4
Florence 2	33,643	78	Spartanburg 7	37,232	4
Florence 3	35,238	46	Sumter 2	34,431	61
Florence 4	33,743	76	Sumter 17	34,573	59
Florence 5	34,093	68	Union	35,108	49
Georgetown	34,692	57	Williamsburg	33,908	72
Greenville	36,588	19	York 1	36,567	20
Greenwood 50	34,917	53	York 2	37,566	2
Greenwood 51	34,243	63	York 3	37,438	3
Greenwood 52	36,137	31	York 4	36,817	13
Hampton 1	34,243	63	State Minimum	\$33,243	
			District Median	\$35,366	

TABLE 85 (Continued)
**SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE PLUS
 EIGHTEEN HOURS AND TEN YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02***
 BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Beaufort	\$37,757	1	Dorchester 2	\$35,365	44
York 2	37,566	2	Jasper	35,304	45
York 3	37,438	3	Florence 3	35,238	46
Spartanburg 1	37,232	4	Lexington 4	35,238	46
Spartanburg 2	37,232	4	Darlington	35,138	48
Spartanburg 3	37,232	4	Union	35,108	49
Spartanburg 4	37,232	4	Berkeley	35,106	50
Spartanburg 5	37,232	4	Newberry	35,071	51
Spartanburg 6	37,232	4	Edgefield	34,993	52
Spartanburg 7	37,232	4	Greenwood 50	34,917	53
Anderson 5	37,016	11	Barnwell 29	34,905	54
Lexington 5	36,900	12	Chesterfield	34,905	54
York 4	36,817	13	Abbeville	34,743	56
Richland 2	36,805	14	Georgetown	34,692	57
Aiken	36,788	15	Lexington 3	34,622	58
Anderson 1	36,734	16	Sumter 17	34,573	59
Richland 1	36,685	17	McCormick	34,442	60
Oconee	36,598	18	Sumter 2	34,431	61
Greenville	36,588	19	Florence 1	34,293	62
Anderson 4	36,587	20	Greenwood 51	34,243	63
Barnwell 45	36,567	20	Hampton 1	34,243	63
York 1	36,567	20	Marlboro	34,243	63
Cherokee	36,445	23	Bamberg 1	34,240	66
Orangeburg 3	36,444	24	Bamberg 2	34,143	67
Orangeburg 4	36,444	24	Florence 5	34,093	68
Orangeburg 5	36,444	24	Marion 1	34,093	68
Chaster	36,401	27	Saluda	34,005	70
Fairfield	36,335	28	Clarendon 1	33,893	71
Anderson 3	36,318	29	Williamsburg	33,898	72
Lexington 2	36,177	30	Clarendon 2	33,893	73
Greenwood 52	36,137	31	Allendale	33,843	74
Horry	36,135	32	Colleton	33,812	75
Lexington 1	36,074	33	Florence 4	33,743	76
Anderson 2	36,069	34	Marion 2	33,743	76
Laurens 55	36,026	35	Florence 2	33,643	78
Lancaster	35,902	36	Lee	33,543	79
Hampton 2	35,571	37	Marion 7	33,543	79
Calhoun	35,570	38	Clarendon 3	33,443	81
Kershaw	35,565	39	Barnwell 19	33,243	82
Laurens 56	35,484	40	Dillon 1	33,243	82
Pickens	35,454	41	Dillon 2	33,243	82
Charleston	35,367	42	Dillon 3	33,243	82
Dorchester 4	35,366	43	State Minimum	\$33,243	
			District Median	\$35,366	

*See References for Tables

**TABLE 06
SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A MASTER'S DEGREE PLUS
SEVENTEEN YEARS OF EXPERIENCE 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Abbeville	\$43,179	59	Hampton 2	\$44,698	38
Aiken	46,124	15	Horry	45,333	32
Allendale	42,279	75	Jasper	44,137	47
Anderson 1	46,055	16	Kershaw	44,574	40
Anderson 2	45,222	34	Lancaster	45,013	36
Anderson 3	45,534	31	Laurans 55	45,105	35
Anderson 4	45,847	21	Laurans 56	44,489	41
Anderson 5	46,410	11	Lee	41,979	79
Bamberg 1	42,928	61	Lexington 1	45,315	33
Bamberg 2	42,579	68	Lexington 2	45,585	29
Barnwell 19	41,679	82	Lexington 3	43,306	58
Barnwell 29	43,763	51	Lexington 4	44,180	45
Barnwell 45	45,847	21	Lexington 5	46,264	12
Beaufort	47,339	1	McCormick	42,879	62
Berkeley	44,016	49	Marion 1	42,529	69
Calhoun	44,597	39	Marion 2	42,179	76
Charleston	44,342	42	Marion 7	41,979	79
Cherokee	45,693	27	Marlboro	42,679	64
Chester	45,639	28	Newberry	43,972	50
Chesterfield	43,763	51	Oconee	45,883	19
Clarendon 1	42,479	72	Orangeburg 3	45,694	24
Clarendon 2	42,379	74	Orangeburg 4	45,694	24
Clarendon 3	41,879	81	Orangeburg 5	45,694	24
Colleton	42,391	73	Pickens	46,049	17
Darlington	44,055	48	Richland 1	45,972	18
Dillon 1	41,679	52	Richland 2	46,221	13
Dillon 2	41,679	52	Saluda	46,634	67
Dillon 3	41,679	52	Spartanburg 1	46,680	5
Dorchester 2	44,340	43	Spartanburg 2	46,680	5
Dorchester 4	44,340	43	Spartanburg 3	46,681	4
Edgefield	43,429	58	Spartanburg 4	46,680	5
Fairfield	45,555	30	Spartanburg 5	46,680	5
Florence 1	42,869	63	Spartanburg 6	46,680	5
Florence 2	42,104	78	Spartanburg 7	46,680	5
Florence 3	44,180	45	Sumter 2	43,169	60
Florence 4	42,179	78	Sumter 17	43,346	57
Florence 5	42,529	69	Union	43,713	53
Georgetown	43,489	54	Williamsburg	42,513	71
Greenville	45,874	20	York 1	45,847	21
Greenwood 50	43,460	55	York 2	47,099	2
Greenwood 51	42,679	64	York 3	46,939	3
Greenwood 52	44,807	37	York 4	46,160	14
Hampton 1	42,679	64	State Minimum	\$41,879	
			District Median	\$44,342	

TABLE 86 (Continued)
**SALARY SCHEDULES FOR TEACHERS WITH A MASTER'S DEGREE PLUS
 SEVENTEEN YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, 2001-02***
 BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Salary	Rank	District	Salary	Rank
Beaufort	\$47,339	1	Dorchester 4	\$44,340	43
York 2	47,099	2	Florence 3	44,180	45
York 3	46,839	3	Lexington 4	44,180	45
Spartanburg 3	46,681	4	Jasper	44,137	47
Spartanburg 1	46,680	5	Darlington	44,055	48
Spartanburg 2	46,680	5	Berkeley	44,018	49
Spartanburg 4	46,680	5	Newberry	43,972	50
Spartanburg 5	46,680	5	Barnwell 29	43,783	51
Spartanburg 6	46,680	5	Chesterfield	43,783	51
Spartanburg 7	46,680	5	Dillon 1	41,879	52
Anderson 5	46,410	11	Dillon 2	41,879	52
Lexington 5	46,264	12	Dillon 3	41,879	52
Richland 2	46,221	13	Union	43,713	53
York 4	46,160	14	Georgetown	43,488	54
Aiken	46,124	15	Greenwood 50	43,460	55
Anderson 1	46,055	16	Edgefield	43,428	56
Pickens	46,049	17	Sumter 17	43,348	57
Richland 1	45,972	18	Lexington 3	43,308	58
Oconee	45,883	19	Abbeville	43,179	59
Greenville	45,874	20	Sumter 2	43,169	60
Anderson 4	45,847	21	Barnberg 1	42,928	61
Barnwell 45	45,847	21	McCormick	42,879	62
York 1	45,847	21	Florence 1	42,869	63
Orangeburg 3	45,694	24	Greenwood 51	42,679	64
Orangeburg 4	45,694	24	Hampton 1	42,679	64
Orangeburg 5	45,694	24	Marlboro	42,679	64
Cherokee	45,693	27	Saluda	46,634	67
Chester	45,639	28	Barnberg 2	42,579	68
Lexington 2	45,585	29	Florence 5	42,529	69
Fairfield	45,555	30	Marion 1	42,529	69
Anderson 3	45,534	31	Williamsburg	42,513	71
Horry	45,333	32	Clarendon 1	42,479	72
Lexington 1	45,315	33	Colleton	42,391	73
Anderson 2	45,222	34	Clarendon 2	42,379	74
Laurens 55	45,105	35	Allendale	42,279	75
Lancaster	46,013	36	Florence 4	42,179	78
Greenwood 52	44,807	37	Marion 2	42,179	78
Hampton 2	44,598	38	Florence 2	42,104	78
Cathoun	44,597	39	Lee	41,979	79
Kershaw	44,574	40	Marion 7	41,979	79
Laurens 56	44,489	41	Clarendon 3	41,879	81
Charleston	44,342	42	Barnwell 19	41,679	82
Dorchester 2	44,340	43	State Minimum	\$41,679	
			District Median	\$44,342	

*See "References for Tables."

**TABLE 87
AVERAGE TOTAL CONTRACTED SALARY FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Average Salary	Rank	District	Average Salary	Rank
Abbeville	\$38,100	58	Hampton 2	\$38,533	55
Aiken	40,066	34	Horry	41,008	18
Allendale	37,737	62	Jasper	33,056	85
Anderson 1	39,850	36	Kershaw	39,848	37
Anderson 2	40,186	31	Lancaster	40,095	33
Anderson 3	38,027	59	Laurens 55	38,830	51
Anderson 4	40,571	28	Laurens 56	40,252	30
Anderson 5	40,413	29	Lee	37,288	67
Bamberg 1	39,238	44	Lexington 1	41,678	10
Bamberg 2	36,071	79	Lexington 2	41,412	13
Barnwell 19	35,700	82	Lexington 3	39,250	43
Barnwell 29	36,075	78	Lexington 4	34,148	83
Barnwell 45	41,724	9	Lexington 5	41,668	11
Beaufort	40,581	24	McCormick	36,087	77
Berkely	38,827	52	Marion 1	37,556	64
Calhoun	42,121	5	Marion 2	36,865	72
Charleston	39,087	47	Marion 7	33,352	84
Cherokee	40,681	22	Marlboro	38,912	49
Chester	40,010	35	Newberry	37,463	66
Chesterfield	39,381	41	Oconee	40,578	25
Clarendon 1	37,488	65	Orangeburg 3	41,067	15
Clarendon 2	38,518	56	Orangeburg 4	40,429	28
Clarendon 3	37,773	61	Orangeburg 5	41,509	12
Colleton	38,542	76	Pickens	40,904	19
Darlington	39,339	42	Richland 1	40,730	21
Dillon 1	36,724	74	Richland 2	40,835	20
Dillon 2	37,234	68	Saluda	36,011	80
Dillon 3	36,831	75	Spartanburg 1	41,180	14
Dorchester 2	39,218	45	Spartanburg 2	41,981	6
Dorchester 4	39,796	39	Spartanburg 3	44,191	1
Edgefield	38,889	54	Spartanburg 4	41,877	8
Fairfield	40,490	27	Spartanburg 5	41,026	16
Florence 1	38,703	53	Spartanburg 6	43,460	3
Florence 2	37,082	71	Spartanburg 7	43,500	2
Florence 3	38,168	57	Sumter 2	36,805	73
Florence 4	37,125	70	Sumter 17	38,015	60
Florence 5	39,705	40	Union	39,818	38
Georgetown	39,099	46	Williamsburg	37,718	63
Greenville	40,116	32	York 1	41,015	17
Greenwood 50	38,839	50	York 2	42,487	4
Greenwood 51	35,802	81	York 3	41,945	7
Greenwood 52	39,018	48	York 4	40,622	23
Hampton 1	37,190	69	State Average	\$39,823	
			District Median	\$39,260	

**TABLE 87(Continued)
AVERAGE TOTAL CONTRACTED SALARY FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Ranked Numerically					
District	Average Salary	Rank	District	Average Salary	Rank
Spartanburg 3	\$44,191	1	Barnberg 1	\$39,238	44
Spartanburg 7	43,500	2	Dorchester 2	39,216	45
Spartanburg 6	43,480	3	Georgetown	39,099	46
York 2	42,487	4	Charleston	39,087	47
Calhoun	42,121	5	Greenwood 52	39,018	48
Spartanburg 2	41,981	6	Marlboro	38,912	49
York 3	41,945	7	Greenwood 50	38,839	50
Spartanburg 4	41,877	8	Laurens 55	38,830	51
Barnwell 45	41,724	9	Berkeley	38,827	52
Lexington 1	41,678	10	Florence 1	38,703	53
Lexington 5	41,668	11	Edgefield	38,669	54
Orangeburg 5	41,509	12	Hampton 2	38,533	55
Lexington 2	41,412	13	Clarendon 2	38,518	56
Spartanburg 1	41,180	14	Florence 3	38,166	57
Orangeburg 3	41,067	15	Abbeville	38,100	58
Spartanburg 5	41,026	16	Anderson 3	38,027	59
York 1	41,015	17	Sumter 17	38,015	60
Horry	41,008	18	Clarendon 3	37,773	61
Pickens	40,904	19	Allendale	37,737	62
Richland 2	40,835	20	Williamsburg	37,716	63
Richland 1	40,730	21	Marion 1	37,556	64
Cherokee	40,681	22	Clarendon 1	37,488	65
York 4	40,622	23	Newberry	37,463	66
Beaufort	40,581	24	Lee	37,288	67
Oconee	40,576	25	Dillon 2	37,234	68
Anderson 4	40,571	26	Hampton 1	37,190	69
Fairfield	40,490	27	Florence 4	37,125	70
Orangeburg 4	40,429	28	Florence 2	37,082	71
Anderson 5	40,413	29	Marion 2	36,865	72
Laurens 56	40,252	30	Sumter 2	36,806	73
Anderson 2	40,188	31	Dillon 1	36,724	74
Greenville	40,118	32	Dillon 3	36,631	75
Lancaster	40,095	33	Colleton	36,542	76
Alton	40,066	34	McCormick	36,087	77
Chester	40,010	35	Barnwell 29	36,075	78
Anderson 1	39,950	36	Barnberg 2	36,071	79
Kershaw	39,848	37	Saluda	36,011	80
Union	39,818	38	Greenwood 51	35,802	81
Dorchester 4	39,798	39	Barnwell 19	35,700	82
Florence 5	39,705	40	Lexington 4	34,148	83
Chesterfield	39,381	41	Merton 7	33,352	84
Darlington	39,339	42	Jasper	33,058	85
Lexington 3	39,250	43	State Average	\$39,923	
			District Median	\$39,250	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 88
PER CAPITA CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY
AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS 2001-02*
BY COUNTY

Listed Alphabetically				
County	Population July 1 2002 (Provisional)	Current Operating Expenditures	Per Capita	Rank
Abbeville	26 422	\$27 128,258	\$1 027	40
Aiken	145,278	152 772,293	1 052	37
Allendale	10 949	18 885 772	1 725	1
Anderson	170 578	189,529 485	1 111	34
Bamberg	16 314	23 802,230	1 459	5
Barnwell	23 407	34,279 038	1 464	4
Beaufort	127 877	133 950 056	1 047	38
Berkeley	145,274	178 887 726	1,218	22
Calhoun	15 368	17 562 997	1 143	33
Charleston	316,558	308 491,344	975	42
Cherokee	53 524	62 399,223	1 168	32
Chester	34,212	46 785,088	1 368	9
Chesterfield	43,206	55 448 150	1,283	12
Clarendon	32,895	41 296 170	1,255	13
Coffey	38 804	46 774 517	1 205	25
Darlington	67 931	82 741,343	1,218	21
Dillon	30 914	39 729,960	1,285	11
Dorchester	100 833	124 878 167	1 238	18
Edgefield	24 868	30,270 144	1,217	23
Fairfield	24 003	34 391,500	1 433	7
Florence	127,237	155 079,075	1,219	20
Georgetown	68,263	84,566 465	1 461	6
Greenville	391 334	380,013 119	971	43
Greenwood	67 461	80 759,964	1 197	28
Hampton	21 316	32,300 853	1 515	3
Horry	206 039	213 695,216	1 037	39
Jasper	20 969	22 197,384	1 059	36
Kershaw	53 830	64 384 932	1,201	26
Lancaster	62,220	74 139,321	1 192	29
Laurens	70 508	64,382 447	913	44
Lee	20 450	25,548 999	1,249	16
Lexington	222,897	348,052,840	1 553	2
McCormick	10,218	10,066,852	985	41
Marion	34 964	47 464 498	1 358	10
Marlboro	28 682	34,870 476	1,216	24
Newberry	36 897	45 085 159	1,222	19
Oconee	67 918	81,517 100	1,200	27
Orangeburg	91 190	126,850,949	1 391	8
Pickens	113 097	103,063,045	911	45
Richland	329 086	362,297 119	1 101	35
Saluda	19 247	17 147,853	891	46
Spartanburg	259 322	303 868,981	1 172	30
Sumner	105 198	123 160 138	1 171	31
Union	29 482	38,827,872	1,263	14
Williamsburg	38,491	45,600,027	1,250	15
York	173,755	215,251,278	1,239	17
State Total	4 107 183	\$4 744,392,523	\$1 155	
County Median			\$1,216	

TABLE 88 (Continued)
PER CAPITA CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY
AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS 2001-02*
BY COUNTY

Ranked Numerically				
County	Population July 1 2002 (Provisional)	Current Operating Expenditures	Per Capita	Rank
Allegheny	10,949	18,885,772	\$1,725	1
Lexington	222,897	346,052,840	1,553	2
Hampton	21,316	32,300,953	1,515	3
Barnwell	23,407	34,279,038	1,464	4
Barnberg	18,314	23,802,230	1,459	5
Georgetown	58,263	84,565,465	1,451	6
Fairfield	24,003	34,391,500	1,433	7
Orangeburg	91,190	126,850,949	1,391	8
Chester	34,212	46,785,088	1,368	9
Marion	34,964	47,464,498	1,358	10
Dillon	30,914	39,729,960	1,285	11
Chesterfield	43,206	55,448,150	1,283	12
Clarendon	32,895	41,286,170	1,255	13
Union	29,482	36,927,872	1,253	14
Williamsburg	36,491	45,600,027	1,250	15
Lee	20,450	25,546,999	1,249	16
York	173,755	215,251,278	1,239	17
Dorchester	100,833	124,878,167	1,238	18
Newberry	36,897	45,085,159	1,222	19
Florence	127,237	155,079,075	1,219	20
Darlington	67,931	82,741,343	1,218	21
Berkeley	145,274	176,887,726	1,218	22
Edgefield	24,888	30,270,144	1,217	23
Marlboro	28,682	34,870,476	1,216	24
Colleton	38,804	46,774,517	1,205	25
Kershaw	53,630	64,384,932	1,201	26
Oconee	67,918	81,517,100	1,200	27
Greenwood	67,481	80,759,964	1,197	28
Lancaster	62,220	74,139,321	1,192	29
Spartanburg	259,322	303,868,981	1,172	30
Sumter	105,198	123,160,138	1,171	31
Cherokee	53,524	62,389,223	1,166	32
Calhoun	15,366	17,562,997	1,143	33
Anderson	170,578	189,529,485	1,111	34
Richland	329,088	362,297,119	1,101	35
Jasper	20,969	22,197,384	1,059	36
Aiken	145,278	152,772,293	1,052	37
Beaufort	127,977	133,950,056	1,047	38
Horry	206,039	213,695,218	1,037	39
Abbeville	28,422	\$27,128,258	1,027	40
McCormick	10,218	10,066,852	985	41
Charleston	316,559	308,491,344	975	42
Greenville	391,334	380,013,119	971	43
Laurens	70,508	64,392,447	913	44
Pickens	113,087	103,063,045	911	45
Saluda	19,247	17,147,853	891	46
State Total	4,107,183	\$4,744,302,523	\$1,155	
County Median			\$1,216	

*See References for Tables.

TABLE 89
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$8,265,352	3,709	\$2,228	42
Aiken	43,788,885	23,884	1,833	64
Allendale	4,844,019	1,822	2,659	27
Anderson 1	17,851,496	7,512	2,376	37
Anderson 2	8,953,200	3,589	2,495	33
Anderson 3	5,087,901	2,572	1,978	57
Anderson 4	9,335,524	2,679	3,485	12
Anderson 5	29,258,464	11,118	2,632	29
Bamberg 1	2,960,665	1,671	1,772	69
Bamberg 2	2,790,731	1,063	2,625	30
Barnwell 19	1,832,520	979	1,872	63
Barnwell 29	1,912,556	947	2,020	53
Barnwell 45	4,608,762	2,702	1,706	70
Beaufort	78,897,587	16,498	4,783	3
Berkeley	46,598,805	25,980	1,794	68
Calhoun	6,441,838	1,972	3,267	14
Charleston	122,630,286	41,829	2,932	19
Cherokee	23,880,822	8,822	2,707	26
Chester	13,450,475	6,367	2,113	48
Chesterfield	15,011,377	7,935	1,892	61
Clarendon 1	2,250,096	1,241	1,813	65
Clarendon 2	4,378,604	3,526	1,241	85
Clarendon 3	1,587,982	1,189	1,336	82
Colleton	12,847,940	6,638	1,905	59
Darlington	28,656,828	11,415	2,510	32
Dillon 1	1,170,155	901	1,299	84
Dillon 2	5,138,960	3,688	1,393	81
Dillon 3	1,983,883	1,486	1,335	83
Dorchester 2	30,094,074	16,666	1,806	67
Dorchester 4	8,064,118	2,422	3,330	13
Edgefield	8,629,502	3,926	2,198	43
Fairfield	19,275,450	3,625	5,317	2
Florence 1	32,629,186	13,614	2,397	38
Florence 2	1,762,356	1,082	1,629	72
Florence 3	6,104,904	4,124	1,480	77
Florence 4	1,533,923	1,072	1,431	79
Florence 5	2,919,861	1,438	2,031	52
Georgetown	38,740,427	9,859	3,727	10
Greenville	145,224,469	59,729	2,431	35
Greenwood 50	22,348,052	8,806	2,538	31
Greenwood 51	2,731,513	1,197	2,282	39
Greenwood 52	6,644,972	1,629	4,079	6
Hampton 1	5,202,731	2,604	1,998	56
Hampton 2	2,734,503	1,443	1,895	60

TABLE 89 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$106,381,222	28,455	\$3,739	9
Jasper	8,148,015	2,839	2,168	46
Kershaw	20,441,994	9,668	2,115	47
Lancaster	20,652,614	10,801	1,912	58
Laurens 55	11,595,708	5,791	2,002	55
Laurens 56	8,760,083	3,349	2,019	64
Lee	4,326,663	2,869	1,508	75
Lexington 1	53,381,417	17,288	3,090	17
Lexington 2	25,233,003	8,696	2,902	21
Lexington 3	8,298,046	2,264	2,782	25
Lexington 4	8,013,675	3,321	1,811	68
Lexington 5	48,658,351	14,755	3,182	15
McCormick	3,117,519	1,070	2,914	20
Marion 1	4,787,591	3,180	1,506	78
Marion 2	3,317,389	2,153	1,541	73
Marion 7	1,816,178	962	1,888	62
Marlboro	7,833,899	5,139	1,524	74
Newberry	13,388,487	5,751	2,328	38
Oconee	41,233,258	10,071	4,094	5
Orangeburg 3	7,934,347	3,660	2,168	45
Orangeburg 4	9,383,604	4,137	2,268	40
Orangeburg 5	20,310,224	7,298	2,783	24
Pickens	33,014,791	15,768	2,095	50
Richland 1	103,748,388	25,873	4,041	7
Richland 2	49,704,370	17,660	2,815	23
Selma	4,408,184	2,087	2,111	49
Spartanburg 1	12,702,525	4,383	2,898	22
Spartanburg 2	18,305,787	8,080	2,266	41
Spartanburg 3	11,339,529	3,122	3,632	11
Spartanburg 4	6,252,238	2,852	2,182	44
Spartanburg 5	24,368,349	5,755	4,233	4
Spartanburg 6	27,001,477	9,102	2,967	18
Spartanburg 7	33,838,284	8,510	3,988	8
Sumter 2	12,805,154	9,170	1,396	80
Sumter 17	14,739,728	8,889	1,696	71
Union	10,293,779	4,967	2,072	51
Williamsburg	8,958,604	6,114	1,465	78
York 1	12,080,056	4,968	2,434	34
York 2	28,192,454	4,600	6,129	1
York 3	39,656,481	14,976	2,648	28
York 4	17,055,153	5,508	3,098	16
State Total	\$1,734,405,098	652,435	\$2,658	
District Median			\$2,198	

TABLE 89 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
York 2	\$28,192,454	4,600	\$6,129	1
Fairfield	19,275,450	3,625	5,317	2
Beaufort	78,897,587	16,496	4,783	3
Spartanburg 5	24,358,349	5,755	4,233	4
Oconee	41,233,256	10,071	4,094	5
Greenwood 52	6,644,972	1,629	4,079	6
Richland 1	103,748,366	25,673	4,041	7
Spartanburg 7	33,938,264	8,610	3,988	8
Horry	106,381,222	28,455	3,739	9
Georgetown	36,740,427	9,859	3,727	10
Spartanburg 3	11,339,529	3,122	3,632	11
Anderson 4	9,335,524	2,679	3,485	12
Dorchester 4	8,064,119	2,422	3,330	13
Calhoun	6,441,838	1,972	3,267	14
Lexington 5	46,658,351	14,755	3,162	15
York 4	17,055,153	5,506	3,098	16
Lexington 1	53,361,417	17,268	3,090	17
Spartanburg 8	27,001,477	9,102	2,967	18
Charleston	122,630,286	41,829	2,932	19
McCormick	3,117,519	1,070	2,914	20
Lexington 2	25,233,003	8,696	2,902	21
Spartanburg 1	12,702,525	4,383	2,898	22
Richland 2	49,704,370	17,660	2,815	23
Orangeburg 5	20,310,224	7,298	2,783	24
Lexington 3	6,298,046	2,264	2,782	25
Cherokee	23,880,622	8,822	2,707	26
Allendale	4,844,019	1,822	2,659	27
York 3	39,658,481	14,976	2,648	28
Anderson 5	29,258,464	11,118	2,632	29
Bamberg 2	2,790,731	1,063	2,625	30
Greenwood 50	22,348,052	8,806	2,538	31
Darlington	28,658,828	11,415	2,510	32
Anderson 2	8,953,200	3,589	2,495	33
York 1	12,090,055	4,968	2,434	34
Greenville	145,224,469	59,729	2,431	35
Florence 1	32,629,186	13,614	2,397	36
Anderson 1	17,851,496	7,512	2,376	37
Newberry	13,388,487	5,751	2,328	38
Greenwood 51	2,731,513	1,197	2,282	39
Orangeburg 4	9,383,604	4,137	2,268	40
Spartanburg 2	18,305,767	8,080	2,266	41
Abbeville	8,265,352	3,709	2,228	42
Edgefield	8,629,502	3,926	2,198	43
Spartanburg 4	6,252,236	2,852	2,192	44

TABLE 89 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Orangeburg 3	\$7,934,347	3,660	\$2,168	45
Jasper	6,149,015	2,839	2,166	46
Kershaw	20,441,994	9,666	2,115	47
Chester	13,450,475	6,367	2,113	48
Seluda	4,406,184	2,087	2,111	49
Pickens	33,014,791	15,758	2,095	50
Union	10,293,779	4,967	2,072	51
Florence 5	2,919,861	1,438	2,031	52
Barnwell 29	1,912,556	947	2,020	53
Laurens 56	6,760,083	3,349	2,019	54
Laurens 55	11,595,708	5,791	2,002	55
Hampton 1	5,202,731	2,604	1,998	56
Anderson 3	5,087,901	2,572	1,978	57
Lancaster	20,652,614	10,801	1,912	58
Colleton	12,647,940	6,638	1,905	59
Hampton 2	2,734,503	1,443	1,895	60
Chesterfield	15,011,377	7,935	1,892	61
Marion 7	1,816,178	962	1,888	62
Barnwell 19	1,832,520	979	1,872	63
Aiken	43,788,885	23,884	1,833	64
Clarendon 1	2,250,096	1,241	1,813	65
Lexington 4	6,013,675	3,321	1,811	66
Dorchester 2	30,094,074	16,866	1,806	67
Berkeley	46,598,805	25,980	1,794	68
Bamberg 1	2,960,665	1,671	1,772	69
Barnwell 45	4,608,762	2,702	1,706	70
Sumter 17	14,739,728	8,689	1,696	71
Florence 2	1,762,358	1,062	1,629	72
Marion 2	3,317,389	2,163	1,541	73
Marlboro	7,833,899	5,139	1,524	74
Lee	4,326,663	2,869	1,508	75
Marion 1	4,787,591	3,180	1,506	76
Florence 3	8,104,904	4,124	1,480	77
Williamsburg	8,958,604	6,114	1,465	78
Florence 4	1,533,923	1,072	1,431	79
Sumter 2	12,805,154	9,170	1,396	80
Dillon 2	5,138,960	3,688	1,393	81
Clarendon 3	1,587,992	1,189	1,336	82
Dillon 3	1,983,863	1,486	1,335	83
Dillon 1	1,170,155	901	1,299	84
Clarendon 2	4,378,604	3,526	1,241	85
State Total	\$1,734,405,096	652,435	\$2,658	
District Median			\$2,198	

*See References for Tables.

TABLE 90
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM STATE SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	State Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$14,788,220	3,709	\$3,987	55
Aiken	88,370,177	23,884	3,700	70
Allendale	9,440,817	1,822	5,182	5
Anderson 1	27,592,212	7,512	3,673	72
Anderson 2	14,830,699	3,589	4,132	43
Anderson 3	9,701,056	2,572	3,772	67
Anderson 4	9,428,949	2,679	3,520	76
Anderson 5	42,364,750	11,118	3,810	62
Bamberg 1	7,589,382	1,671	4,542	15
Bamberg 2	5,606,745	1,083	5,274	3
Barnwell 19	5,105,342	979	5,215	4
Barnwell 29	4,658,941	947	4,920	8
Barnwell 45	11,269,234	2,702	4,171	41
Beaufort	39,484,674	16,496	2,394	84
Berkeley	102,381,540	25,980	3,941	59
Calhoun	8,718,145	1,972	4,421	25
Charleston	137,562,364	41,829	3,289	80
Cherokee	33,357,139	8,822	3,781	65
Chester	27,466,214	6,367	4,314	32
Chesterfield	32,721,548	7,935	4,124	44
Clarendon 1	6,135,818	1,241	4,944	7
Clarendon 2	14,471,166	3,526	4,104	45
Clarendon 3	5,415,284	1,189	4,554	14
Colleton	26,598,605	6,638	4,007	53
Darlington	45,531,790	11,415	3,989	54
Dillon 1	3,987,410	901	4,426	24
Dillon 2	16,012,365	3,688	4,342	29
Dillon 3	6,290,822	1,486	4,233	40
Dorchester 2	66,300,639	16,666	3,978	56
Dorchester 4	10,350,410	2,422	4,273	35
Edgefield	17,162,595	3,928	4,372	28
Fairfield	13,288,382	3,625	3,685	73
Florence 1	50,201,835	13,614	3,688	71
Florence 2	4,878,578	1,082	4,509	18
Florence 3	18,424,033	4,124	4,468	22
Florence 4	5,317,708	1,072	4,961	6
Florence 5	6,148,539	1,438	4,276	34
Georgetown	37,425,918	9,859	3,796	64
Greenville	211,878,948	59,729	3,547	75
Greenwood 50	34,192,361	8,806	3,883	61
Greenwood 51	5,368,213	1,197	4,478	21
Greenwood 52	4,003,607	1,629	2,458	83
Hampton 1	11,275,085	2,604	4,330	31
Hampton 2	7,678,264	1,443	5,321	2

TABLE 90 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM STATE SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	State Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$84,973,704	28,455	\$2,986	82
Jasper	12,888,009	2,839	4,540	16
Kershaw	38,145,906	9,666	3,948	58
Lancaster	43,795,752	10,801	4,055	50
Laurens 55	23,628,814	5,791	4,080	47
Laurens 56	14,365,360	3,349	4,289	33
Lee	13,697,263	2,869	4,774	9
Lexington 1	69,565,964	17,268	4,029	61
Lexington 2	38,895,720	8,696	4,243	39
Lexington 3	10,030,973	2,264	4,431	23
Lexington 4	13,839,516	3,321	4,167	42
Lexington 5	59,148,540	14,755	4,009	52
McCormick	4,678,744	1,070	4,373	27
Manon 1	14,294,403	3,180	4,495	19
Manon 2	9,985,978	2,153	4,638	13
Marion 7	6,407,173	962	6,660	1
Marlboro	21,903,117	5,139	4,262	37
Newberry	24,926,571	5,751	4,334	30
Oconee	34,384,244	10,071	3,414	79
Orangeburg 3	17,058,637	3,660	4,661	12
Orangeburg 4	18,359,511	4,137	3,954	57
Orangeburg 5	34,232,129	7,288	4,691	11
Pickens	59,329,004	15,758	3,765	68
Richland 1	104,114,270	25,673	4,055	49
Richland 2	66,616,841	17,660	3,772	66
Saluda	9,844,388	2,087	4,717	10
Spartanburg 1	17,901,652	4,383	4,084	46
Spartanburg 2	29,600,384	8,080	3,663	74
Spartanburg 3	12,184,661	3,122	3,903	60
Spartanburg 4	10,635,858	2,852	3,799	63
Spartanburg 5	18,760,490	5,755	3,260	81
Spartanburg 6	31,931,721	9,102	3,508	77
Spartanburg 7	38,390,898	8,510	4,511	17
Sumter 2	38,958,195	9,170	4,248	38
Sumter 17	37,107,388	8,689	4,271	36
Union	22,245,918	4,967	4,479	20
Williamsburg	26,699,562	6,114	4,400	26
York 1	20,148,978	4,968	4,056	48
York 2	9,601,415	4,600	2,087	85
York 3	55,801,214	14,978	3,726	69
York 4	18,924,181	5,506	3,437	78
State Total	\$2,495,167,669	652,435	\$3,824	
District Median			\$4,132	

TABLE 90 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM STATE SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	State Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Marion 7	\$6 407 173	962	\$6 680	1
Hampton 2	7 678 264	1 443	5 321	2
Barnberg 2	5 606 745	1 063	5 274	3
Barnwell 19	5 105 342	979	5 215	4
Allendale	9 440 817	1 822	5 182	5
Florence 4	5 317 708	1 072	4 961	6
Clarendon 1	6 135 818	1 241	4 944	7
Barnwell 29	4 658 941	947	4 920	8
Lee	13 697 263	2 869	4 774	9
Saluda	9 844 388	2 067	4 717	10
Orangeburg 5	34 232 129	7 298	4 691	11
Orangeburg 3	17 058 637	3 660	4 661	12
Marion 2	9 985 978	2 153	4 638	13
Clarendon 3	5 415 284	1 189	4 554	14
Barnberg 1	7 589 382	1 671	4 542	15
Jasper	12 888 009	2 839	4 540	16
Spartanburg 7	38 390 898	8 510	4 511	17
Florence 2	4 878 578	1 082	4 509	18
Marion 1	14 284 403	3 180	4 495	19
Union	22 245 918	4 967	4 479	20
Greenwood 51	5 358 213	1 197	4 476	21
Florence 3	18 424 033	4 124	4 468	22
Lexington 3	10 030 973	2 284	4 431	23
Dillon 1	3 987 410	901	4 426	24
Calhoun	8 718 145	1 972	4 421	25
Williamsburg	26 899 562	6 114	4 400	26
McCormick	4 678 744	1 070	4 373	27
Edgefield	17 162 595	3 826	4 372	28
Dillon 2	18 012 385	3 888	4 342	29
Newberry	24 826 571	5 751	4 334	30
Hampton 1	11 275 085	2 604	4 330	31
Chester	27 466 214	6 367	4 314	32
Laurens 56	14 365 360	3 349	4 289	33
Florence 5	6 148 539	1 438	4 276	34
Dorchester 4	10 350 410	2 422	4 273	35
Sumter 17	37 107 388	8 689	4 271	36
Marlboro	21 903 117	5 139	4 262	37
Sumter 2	38 958 195	9 170	4 248	38
Lexington 2	36 895 720	8 696	4 243	39
Dillon 3	6 290 822	1 486	4 233	40
Barnwell 45	11 269 234	2 702	4 171	41
Lexington 4	13 839 516	3 321	4 167	42
Anderson 2	14 830 699	3 589	4 132	43
Chesterfield	32 721 548	7 935	4 124	44

TABLE 90 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM STATE SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	State Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Clarendon 2	\$14,471,166	3,526	\$4,104	45
Spartanburg 1	17,901,852	4,383	4,084	46
Laurens 55	23,628,814	5,791	4,080	47
York 1	20,148,978	4,968	4,056	48
Richland 1	104,114,270	25,673	4,055	49
Lancaster	43,795,752	10,801	4,055	50
Lexington 1	69,585,964	17,268	4,029	51
Lexington 5	59,148,540	14,755	4,009	52
Colleton	26,598,605	6,638	4,007	53
Darlington	45,531,790	11,415	3,989	54
Abbeville	14,788,220	3,709	3,987	55
Dorchester 2	66,300,839	16,666	3,978	56
Orangeburg 4	16,359,511	4,137	3,954	57
Kershaw	38,145,906	9,666	3,946	58
Berkeley	102,381,540	25,980	3,941	59
Spartanburg 3	12,184,661	3,122	3,903	60
Greenwood 50	34,182,361	8,606	3,883	61
Anderson 5	42,364,750	11,118	3,810	62
Spartanburg 4	10,835,958	2,852	3,799	63
Georgetown	37,425,918	9,859	3,796	64
Cherokee	33,357,139	8,822	3,781	65
Richland 2	66,616,841	17,660	3,772	66
Anderson 3	9,701,058	2,572	3,772	67
Pickens	59,329,004	16,768	3,765	68
York 3	55,801,214	14,976	3,726	69
Aiken	88,370,177	23,884	3,700	70
Florence 1	50,201,835	13,814	3,688	71
Anderson 1	27,582,212	7,512	3,673	72
Fairfield	13,286,382	3,625	3,665	73
Spartanburg 2	29,800,384	8,080	3,663	74
Greenville	211,878,948	59,729	3,547	75
Anderson 4	9,428,949	2,679	3,520	76
Spartanburg 6	31,931,721	9,102	3,508	77
York 4	18,924,181	5,506	3,437	78
Oconee	34,384,244	10,071	3,414	79
Charleston	137,562,384	41,829	3,289	80
Spartanburg 5	18,760,490	5,755	3,260	81
Horry	84,973,704	28,455	2,988	82
Greenwood 52	4,003,607	1,629	2,458	83
Beaufort	39,484,674	16,496	2,394	84
York 2	9,601,415	4,600	2,087	85
State Total	\$2,495,167,669	662,436	\$3,824	
District Median			\$4,132	

See "References for Tables."

TABLE 91
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM FEDERAL SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$3 485 394	3 709	\$940	41
Aiken	13 582,221	23 884	569	69
Allendale	4 591 458	1 822	2,520	3
Anderson 1	4,203 126	7 512	560	71
Anderson 2	5,317 716	3 589	1 482	11
Anderson 3	1 548 570	2 572	601	65
Anderson 4	1,360,278	2 679	508	75
Anderson 5	9 404,256	11 118	846	45
Bamberg 1	2,007 077	1,871	1,201	17
Bamberg 2	1 888 348	1,083	1 775	6
Barnwell 19	1,328 318	979	1 357	15
Barnwell 29	909 774	947	961	38
Barnwell 45	2,288,804	2 702	847	44
Beaufort	12,589 667	16 496	763	57
Berkeley	21 671 616	25,980	834	47
Cathoun	2,056 644	1,972	1,043	29
Charleston	33 754,220	41 829	807	51
Cherokee	5,132 612	8,822	582	67
Chester	4 918 572	6,387	773	55
Chesterfield	5,653 189	7,835	712	58
Clarendon 1	2,243 379	1,241	1,808	5
Clarendon 2	5,680,855	3 526	1 583	9
Clarendon 3	820,262	1 189	774	54
Colleton	6 534 773	6 638	984	32
Darlington	10 740 678	11 415	941	40
Dillon 1	881 929	901	979	35
Dillon 2	3 684 479	3 688	999	31
Dillon 3	3 368 934	1 488	2,287	4
Dorchester 2	6 886 446	16 666	413	81
Dorchester 4	2 714,834	2,422	1 121	22
Edgefield	3 935 007	3,828	1 002	30
Fairfield	3 562,335	3 625	983	34
Florence 1	11,242 024	13,814	826	50
Florence 2	2,816 389	1 082	2,603	2
Florence 3	5 812,825	4 124	1 409	13
Florence 4	1 728,228	1,072	1 612	8
Florence 5	1,207 030	1 438	839	46
Georgetown	8 630,573	9 859	875	43
Greenville	32,061,611	59 729	537	72
Greenwood 50	5,558 835	8,806	631	61
Greenwood 51	1 320,243	1 197	1 103	24
Greenwood 52	989 186	1 629	607	64
Hampton 1	2,164,877	2 604	831	48
Hampton 2	2 440,850	1 443	1 682	7

TABLE 91 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM FEDERAL SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$17,995,408	28,455	\$632	60
Jasper	3,270,088	2,839	1,152	20
Kershaw	5,738,769	9,666	593	66
Lancaster	8,244,783	10,801	763	56
Laurens 55	3,828,069	5,791	661	59
Laurens 56	2,685,892	3,349	805	52
Lee	3,834,831	2,869	1,337	16
Lexington 1	5,985,032	17,268	347	83
Lexington 2	5,437,083	8,696	625	62
Lexington 3	2,427,497	2,264	1,072	26
Lexington 4	3,474,255	3,321	1,046	28
Lexington 5	5,090,944	14,755	345	84
McCormick	4,049,454	1,070	3,785	1
Marion 1	3,688,600	3,180	1,160	19
Marion 2	3,028,073	2,153	1,406	14
Marion 7	1,429,049	962	1,485	10
Marlboro	5,023,357	5,139	977	36
Newberry	4,652,298	5,751	792	53
Oconee	6,291,840	10,071	625	63
Orangeburg 3	4,332,255	3,660	1,184	18
Orangeburg 4	3,701,721	4,137	895	42
Orangeburg 5	8,300,833	7,298	1,137	21
Pickens	8,065,638	15,758	512	74
Richland 1	25,244,296	25,873	983	33
Richland 2	7,470,261	17,660	423	80
Saluda	2,029,581	2,087	972	37
Spartanburg 1	2,204,845	4,383	503	76
Spartanburg 2	3,298,717	8,080	408	82
Spartanburg 3	3,481,894	3,122	1,115	23
Spartanburg 4	1,809,574	2,852	564	70
Spartanburg 5	3,013,909	5,766	524	73
Spartanburg 6	3,943,288	9,102	433	79
Spartanburg 7	8,158,435	8,510	959	39
Sumter 2	9,789,879	9,170	1,068	27
Sumter 17	9,562,879	8,689	1,099	25
Union	4,106,423	4,967	827	49
Williamsburg	8,874,168	6,114	1,419	12
York 1	2,834,153	4,968	570	68
York 2	2,001,861	4,600	435	78
York 3	6,577,812	14,976	439	77
York 4	1,422,780	5,506	258	85
State Total	\$490,610,366	652,435	\$752	
District Median			\$875	

TABLE 01 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM FEDERAL SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
McCormick	\$4,049,454	1,070	\$3,785	1
Florence 2	2,818,389	1,082	2,603	2
Allendale	4,591,456	1,822	2,520	3
Dillon 3	3,368,934	1,486	2,267	4
Clarendon 1	2,243,379	1,241	1,808	5
Bamberg 2	1,888,348	1,063	1,775	6
Hampton 2	2,440,850	1,443	1,692	7
Florence 4	1,728,228	1,072	1,612	8
Clarendon 2	5,580,855	3,526	1,583	9
Marion 7	1,429,049	962	1,485	10
Anderson 2	5,317,716	3,589	1,482	11
Williamsburg	8,674,166	6,114	1,419	12
Florence 3	5,812,625	4,124	1,409	13
Marion 2	3,028,073	2,153	1,406	14
Barnwell 19	1,328,316	979	1,357	15
Lee	3,834,931	2,869	1,337	16
Bamberg 1	2,007,077	1,671	1,201	17
Orangeburg 3	4,332,255	3,660	1,184	18
Marion 1	3,688,600	3,180	1,160	19
Jasper	3,270,088	2,839	1,152	20
Orangeburg 5	8,300,833	7,298	1,137	21
Dorchester 4	2,714,634	2,422	1,121	22
Spartanburg 3	3,481,894	3,122	1,115	23
Greenwood 51	1,320,243	1,197	1,103	24
Sumter 17	9,552,679	8,689	1,099	25
Lexington 3	2,427,497	2,264	1,072	26
Sumter 2	9,789,879	9,170	1,068	27
Lexington 4	3,474,255	3,321	1,046	28
Calhoun	2,058,644	1,972	1,043	29
Edgefield	3,935,007	3,928	1,002	30
Dillon 2	3,684,479	3,688	999	31
Colleton	6,534,773	6,638	984	32
Richland 1	25,244,298	25,673	983	33
Fairfield	3,562,335	3,625	983	34
Dillon 1	881,929	901	979	35
Marlboro	5,023,357	5,139	977	36
Saluda	2,029,581	2,087	972	37
Barnwell 29	909,774	947	961	38
Spartanburg 7	8,158,435	8,510	959	39
Darlington	10,740,678	11,415	941	40
Abbeville	3,485,394	3,709	940	41
Orangeburg 4	3,701,721	4,137	895	42
Georgetown	8,630,573	9,869	875	43
Barnwell 45	2,288,804	2,702	847	44

TABLE 91 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM FEDERAL SOURCES (EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Anderson 5	\$9,404,258	11,118	\$846	45
Florence 5	1,207,030	1,438	839	46
Berkeley	21,871,818	25,980	834	47
Hampton 1	2,164,877	2,604	831	48
Union	4,108,423	4,987	827	49
Florence 1	11,242,024	13,614	826	50
Charleston	33,754,220	41,828	807	51
Laurens 56	2,695,892	3,349	805	52
Newberry	4,552,298	5,751	792	53
Clarendon 3	820,262	1,189	774	54
Chester	4,818,572	6,387	773	55
Lancaster	8,244,783	10,801	763	56
Beaufort	12,589,667	16,498	763	57
Chesterfield	5,853,199	7,935	712	58
Laurens 55	3,828,069	5,791	661	59
Horry	17,995,406	28,455	632	60
Greenwood 50	5,556,635	8,806	631	61
Lexington 2	5,437,083	8,698	625	62
Oconee	6,291,840	10,071	625	63
Greenwood 52	989,188	1,629	607	64
Anderson 3	1,546,670	2,572	601	65
Kershaw	5,738,769	9,668	593	68
Cherokee	5,132,812	8,822	582	67
York 1	2,834,153	4,968	570	68
Alken	13,582,221	23,884	569	69
Spartanburg 4	1,609,574	2,852	564	70
Anderson 1	4,203,126	7,512	560	71
Greenville	32,061,611	59,729	537	72
Spartanburg 5	3,013,909	5,755	524	73
Pickens	8,085,638	15,758	512	74
Anderson 4	1,360,278	2,679	508	75
Spartanburg 1	2,204,845	4,383	503	76
York 3	6,577,912	14,978	439	77
York 2	2,001,861	4,600	435	78
Spartanburg 6	3,943,288	9,102	433	79
Richland 2	7,470,281	17,680	423	80
Dorchester 2	6,886,446	16,688	413	81
Spartanburg 2	3,298,717	8,080	408	82
Lexington 1	5,985,032	17,288	347	83
Lexington 5	5,090,944	14,755	345	84
York 4	1,422,780	5,508	258	85
State Total	\$490,610,368	652,435	\$752	
District Median			\$675	

See "References for Tables"

TABLE 92
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local, State, and Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$26,538,968	3,709	\$7,155	49
Aiken	145,741,283	23,884	6,102	85
Allendale	18,876,292	1,822	10,360	2
Anderson 1	49,646,835	7,512	6,609	77
Anderson 2	29,101,615	3,589	8,109	20
Anderson 3	16,335,527	2,572	6,351	82
Anderson 4	20,124,751	2,679	7,512	36
Anderson 5	81,027,470	11,118	7,288	44
Bamberg 1	12,557,124	1,671	7,515	35
Bamberg 2	10,283,824	1,063	9,674	5
Barnwell 19	8,266,178	979	8,443	16
Barnwell 29	7,481,271	947	7,900	25
Barnwell 45	18,166,799	2,702	6,723	72
Beaufort	130,971,928	16,496	7,940	24
Berkeley	170,651,961	25,980	6,569	78
Calhoun	17,216,627	1,972	8,731	10
Charleston	293,946,870	41,829	7,027	58
Cherokee	62,370,373	8,822	7,070	54
Chester	45,835,261	6,367	7,199	48
Chesterfield	53,388,124	7,835	6,728	71
Clarendon 1	10,629,294	1,241	8,585	15
Clarendon 2	24,428,624	3,528	6,928	61
Clarendon 3	7,923,538	1,189	6,664	75
Colleton	45,781,318	6,638	6,897	64
Darlington	84,929,296	11,415	7,440	40
Dillon 1	8,039,494	901	6,703	74
Dillon 2	24,835,804	3,688	6,734	69
Dillon 3	11,843,618	1,488	7,836	28
Dorchester 2	103,281,160	16,666	6,197	84
Dorchester 4	21,129,182	2,422	8,724	11
Edgefield	29,727,104	3,926	7,572	33
Fairfield	38,124,187	3,625	9,985	4
Florence 1	94,073,045	13,814	6,910	62
Florence 2	9,457,325	1,082	8,741	9
Florence 3	30,341,562	4,124	7,357	42
Florence 4	8,579,859	1,072	8,004	23
Florence 5	10,275,430	1,438	7,146	50
Georgetown	82,786,918	9,859	8,398	17
Greenville	389,165,028	59,729	6,518	80
Greenwood 50	62,097,049	8,806	7,052	57
Greenwood 51	9,409,969	1,197	7,881	26
Greenwood 52	11,637,764	1,629	7,144	51
Hampton 1	18,642,693	2,604	7,159	48
Hampton 2	12,853,617	1,443	8,908	6

TABLE 92 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Local, State and Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$209,350,332	28,455	\$7,357	43
Jasper	22,307,112	2,839	7,857	27
Kershaw	64,324,669	9,666	6,655	76
Lancaster	72,693,149	10,801	6,730	70
Laurens 55	39,052,591	5,791	6,744	68
Laurens 56	23,821,335	3,349	7,113	53
Lee	21,858,857	2,869	7,619	31
Lexington 1	128,912,413	17,268	7,465	38
Lexington 2	67,585,808	8,696	7,770	36
Lexington 3	18,758,516	2,264	8,285	18
Lexington 4	23,327,448	3,321	7,024	59
Lexington 5	110,895,835	14,755	7,518	34
McCormick	11,845,717	1,070	11,071	1
Marion 1	22,770,593	3,180	7,161	47
Marion 2	16,331,440	2,153	7,585	32
Marion 7	9,652,399	962	10,034	3
Marlboro	34,760,373	5,139	6,764	67
Newberry	42,887,356	5,751	7,454	39
Oconee	81,909,340	10,071	8,133	19
Orangeburg 3	29,325,239	3,660	8,012	22
Orangeburg 4	29,444,836	4,137	7,117	52
Orangeburg 5	62,843,188	7,298	8,611	14
Pickens	100,409,433	15,758	6,372	81
Richland 1	233,108,932	25,673	9,080	7
Richland 2	123,791,472	17,660	7,010	60
Saluda	16,280,153	2,087	7,801	29
Spartanburg 1	32,809,023	4,383	7,488	37
Spartanburg 2	51,204,867	8,080	6,337	83
Spartanburg 3	27,008,085	3,122	8,650	13
Spartanburg 4	18,897,789	2,852	6,556	79
Spartanburg 5	46,132,749	5,755	8,016	21
Spartanburg 6	62,878,485	9,102	6,908	63
Spartanburg 7	80,485,598	8,510	9,458	6
Sumter 2	61,553,228	9,170	6,712	73
Sumter 17	61,399,795	8,689	7,068	55
Union	36,648,120	4,967	7,378	41
Williamsburg	44,530,332	6,114	7,283	45
York 1	35,073,188	4,968	7,060	56
York 2	39,795,730	4,600	8,651	12
York 3	102,035,607	14,976	6,813	65
York 4	37,402,114	5,506	6,793	66
State Total	\$4,726,183,133	652,435	\$7,235	
District Median			\$7,357	

TABLE 92 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE), 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local, State and Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
McCormick	\$11 845 717	1 070	\$11 071	1
Allendale	18 876,292	1 822	10 360	2
Marion 7	9 652,399	962	10 034	3
Fairfield	36 124 167	3 625	9,965	4
Barnberg 2	10,283 824	1 063	9 674	5
Spartanburg 7	80 485,596	8,510	9 458	6
Richland 1	233 106 932	25 673	9 080	7
Hampton 2	12,853 617	1 443	8 908	8
Florence 2	9 457 325	1 082	8 741	9
Calhoun	17,216 627	1 972	8 731	10
Dorchester 4	21 129 162	2 422	8 724	11
York 2	39 795 730	4 600	8 651	12
Spartanburg 3	27 006 085	3 122	8 650	13
Orangeburg 5	62 843 188	7,298	8 611	14
Clarendon 1	10 629,294	1,241	8 565	15
Barnwell 19	8,266,178	979	8 443	16
Georgetown	82,796 918	9,859	8 398	17
Lexington 3	18 756 516	2,264	8,285	18
Oconee	81 909 340	10 071	8 133	19
Anderson 2	29 101 615	3 589	8 109	20
Spartanburg 5	46,132 749	5 755	8 018	21
Orangeburg 3	29 325,239	3 680	8 012	22
Florence 4	8 579 859	1 072	8 004	23
Beaufort	130 971,928	16 496	7 940	24
Barnwell 29	7 481,271	947	7 900	25
Greenwood 51	9 409 969	1 197	7 861	26
Jasper	22 307 112	2 839	7 857	27
Dillon 3	11 843 618	1 486	7 836	28
Saluda	16,280 153	2,067	7,801	29
Lexington 2	67 565 806	8 696	7 770	30
Lee	21,858 857	2,868	7 619	31
Marion 2	16,331 440	2 153	7 585	32
Edgefield	29 727 104	3 928	7 572	33
Lexington 5	110,895 835	14 755	7 516	34
Barnberg 1	12,557 124	1 671	7 515	35
Anderson 4	20 124 751	2 679	7 512	36
Spartanburg 1	32,809 023	4,383	7 486	37
Lexington 1	128 912 413	17,268	7 465	38
Newberry	42,867 356	5 751	7 454	39
Darlington	84 929,296	11 415	7 440	40
Union	36,846 120	4 967	7 378	41
Florence 3	30,341 562	4 124	7,357	42
Horry	209,350 332	28 455	7,357	43
Anderson 5	81 027 470	11 118	7,288	44

TABLE 92 (Continued)
REVENUE PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE) 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local, State and Federal Revenue	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Williamsburg	\$44,530,332	6 114	\$7,283	45
Chester	45,835,261	6,367	7 199	46
Marion 1	22,770 593	3 180	7 161	47
Hampton 1	18,642 693	2 604	7 159	48
Abbeville	28,538,968	3 709	7 155	49
Florence 5	10,275 430	1 438	7 146	50
Greenwood 52	11 637 784	1 629	7 144	51
Orangeburg 4	29 444,838	4 137	7 117	52
Laurens 56	23 821,335	3,349	7 113	53
Cherokee	62,370,373	8 822	7 070	54
Sumter 17	61,399 795	8,889	7 068	55
York 1	35 073,188	4,966	7 060	56
Greenwood 50	62 097 049	8,806	7 052	57
Charleston	293 946,870	41,829	7 027	58
Lexington 4	23,327 446	3,321	7 024	59
Richland 2	123 791 472	17 660	7 010	60
Clarendon 2	24 428,624	3,526	6 928	61
Florence 1	94,073,045	13 614	6 910	62
Spartanburg 6	62,876 485	8,102	6 908	63
Columbia	45 781,318	6 638	6,897	64
York 3	102,035 607	14 976	6,813	65
York 4	37 402,114	5 506	6 793	66
Marlboro	34 760,373	5 139	6 764	67
Laurens 55	39 052,591	5 791	6 744	68
Dillon 2	24,835 904	3 688	6 734	69
Lancaster	72 693,149	10 801	6 730	70
Chesterfield	53,386 124	7 935	6 728	71
Barnwell 45	18,166 799	2,702	6 723	72
Sumter 2	61,553,228	9 170	6,712	73
Dillon 1	6 039,494	901	6 703	74
Clarendon 3	7 923,538	1 189	6 664	75
Kershaw	84,324 869	9 666	6,655	76
Anderson 1	49 648,835	7 512	6 609	77
Berkeley	170 651 961	25,980	6,589	78
Spartanburg 4	18 697 769	2,852	6 556	79
Greenville	389 185,028	59 729	6,516	80
Pickens	100 409 433	15,758	6,372	81
Anderson 3	18 335,527	2,672	6,351	82
Spartanburg 2	51,204,867	8 080	6,337	83
Dorchester 2	103,281 160	16,666	6 197	84
Aiken	145 741,283	23,884	6 102	85
State Total	\$4,720,183,133	652,435	\$7,235	
District Median			\$7,357	

*See References for Tables

TABLE 93
INCREASE IN REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE,
AND FEDERAL SOURCES FROM 1997-98 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Listed Alphabetically			Rank
	Local, State and Federal Revenue Per Pupil 1997-98	2001-02	Increase	
Abbeville	\$5 408	\$7 155	\$1 747	49
Aiken	4,862	6 102	1,240	85
Allendale	6,335	10 360	4 025	2
Anderson 1	5 199	6 609	1 410	77
Anderson 2	5 608	8 109	2 503	20
Anderson 3	5 020	6 351	1 331	82
Anderson 4	5 751	7 512	1 761	36
Anderson 5	5 442	7,288	1,846	44
Barnberg 1	5 855	7 515	1 660	35
Barnberg 2	6 868	9 674	2 808	5
Barnwell 19	6 458	8 443	1,985	18
Barnwell 29	6 168	7 900	1 734	25
Barnwell 45	5 311	6 723	1 412	72
Beaufort	6 060	7 940	1 880	24
Berkeley	5,205	6 569	1,364	78
Calhoun	6 718	8 731	2 015	10
Charleston	5 345	7 027	1 682	58
Cherokee	5 773	7 070	1,297	54
Chester	5 547	7 199	1 652	46
Chesterfield	5 469	6 728	1,259	71
Clarendon 1	5 702	8,565	2,863	15
Clarendon 2	5 005	6 928	1,923	61
Clarendon 3	5 508	6 684	1 156	75
Colleton	5 572	6 897	1,325	64
Darlington	6,237	7 440	1,203	40
Dillon 1	5,222	6 703	1 481	74
Dillon 2	5 111	6 734	1,623	68
Dillon 3	5 485	7 838	2,351	28
Dorchester 2	4 996	6 197	1,201	84
Dorchester 4	6 635	8 724	2,089	11
Edgefield	5 659	7,572	1,913	33
Fairfield	8 373	9 965	1,592	4
Florence 1	5 123	6,910	1 787	62
Florence 2	5 824	8 741	2,917	9
Florence 3	5 643	7 357	1 714	42
Florence 4	5 965	8 004	2,039	23
Florence 5	5 938	7 146	1,208	50
Georgetown	6 732	8 398	1,666	17
Greenville	5 048	6 516	1,470	80
Greenwood 50	5 723	7 052	1,329	57
Greenwood 51	5 507	7 861	2,354	26
Greenwood 52	5 691	7 144	1,453	51
Hampton 1	6 055	7 159	1 104	48
Hampton 2	6 670	8 908	2,238	8

TABLE 93 (Continued)
INCREASE IN REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE,
AND FEDERAL SOURCES FROM 1997-98 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local, State, and Federal Revenue Per Pupil			Rank
	1997-98	2001-02	Increase	
Horry	\$5,975	\$7,357	\$1,382	43
Jasper	5,899	7,857	1,958	27
Kershaw	5,334	6,855	1,321	76
Lancaster	5,540	6,730	1,190	70
Laurens 55	5,182	6,744	1,562	68
Laurens 56	5,457	7,113	1,656	53
Lee	5,556	7,619	2,063	31
Lexington 1	5,445	7,485	2,020	38
Lexington 2	6,139	7,770	1,631	30
Lexington 3	6,041	8,285	2,244	18
Lexington 4	5,688	7,024	1,336	59
Lexington 5	5,828	7,516	1,688	34
McCormick	6,848	11,071	4,223	1
Marion 1	5,590	7,181	1,571	47
Marion 2	5,990	7,585	1,595	32
Marion 7	13,872	10,034	-3,838	3
Marlboro	5,351	6,784	1,413	67
Newberry	5,832	7,454	1,622	39
Oconee	6,323	8,133	1,810	19
Orangeburg 3	6,232	8,012	1,780	22
Orangeburg 4	5,979	7,117	1,138	52
Orangeburg 5	6,773	8,611	1,838	14
Pickens	5,050	6,372	1,313	81
Richland 1	6,707	9,080	2,373	7
Richland 2	5,833	7,010	1,177	60
Saluda	5,696	7,801	2,105	29
Spartanburg 1	5,891	7,486	1,595	37
Spartanburg 2	5,400	6,337	937	83
Spartanburg 3	6,989	8,850	1,861	13
Spartanburg 4	5,482	6,556	1,074	79
Spartanburg 5	6,556	8,018	1,460	21
Spartanburg 6	5,358	6,808	1,450	63
Spartanburg 7	7,556	9,456	1,900	6
Sumter 2	5,252	6,712	1,460	73
Sumter 17	5,378	7,066	1,688	55
Union	5,602	7,378	1,776	41
Williamsburg	5,893	7,283	1,390	45
York 1	5,660	7,060	1,400	56
York 2	6,847	8,651	1,804	12
York 3	5,498	6,813	1,315	65
York 4	5,294	6,783	1,489	66
State Total	\$5,680	\$7,235	\$1,575	
District Median			\$1,652	

TABLE 93 (Continued)
INCREASE IN REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE
AND FEDERAL SOURCES FROM 1997-98 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically			Rank
	Local, State, and Federal Revenue Per Pupil 1997-98	2001-02	Increase	
McCormick	\$6 848	\$11 071	\$4,223	1
Alford	6 335	10,360	4 025	2
Manon 7	6 969	10,034	3 065	3
Clarendon 1	5 702	8 565	2 863	4
Florence 2	5 924	8 741	2,817	5
Barnberg 2	6 866	9 674	2,808	6
Anderson 2	5,606	8 109	2 503	7
Richland 1	6 707	9,080	2,373	8
Greenwood 51	5 507	7 881	2,354	9
Dillon 3	5 465	7,836	2,351	10
Lexington 3	6 041	8,285	2,244	11
Hampton 2	6 670	8,908	2,238	12
Saluda	5 696	7,801	2,105	13
Dorchester 4	6 635	8 724	2,089	14
Lee	5 556	7 619	2,063	15
Florence 4	5 965	8 004	2 039	16
Lexington 1	5 445	7 465	2 020	17
Calhoun	6 716	8 731	2,015	18
Barnwell 19	6 458	8 443	1 985	19
Jasper	5 899	7,857	1 958	20
Clarendon 2	5,005	6 928	1 923	21
Edgefield	5,659	7 572	1,913	22
Spartanburg 7	7 558	9 458	1 900	23
Beaufort	6 060	7,940	1 880	24
Anderson 5	5 442	7,288	1,846	25
Orangeburg 5	6 773	8 611	1 838	26
Oconee	6 323	8 133	1 810	27
York 2	6 847	8 651	1 804	28
Florence 1	5 123	6,910	1 787	29
Orangeburg 3	6,232	8,012	1 780	30
Union	5 602	7,378	1 778	31
Anderson 4	5 751	7,512	1 761	32
Abbeville	5 408	7 155	1 747	33
Barnwell 29	6 166	7 900	1 734	34
Florence 3	5 643	7,357	1 714	35
Sumter 17	5 378	7 066	1 688	36
Lexington 5	5,828	7,516	1 688	37
Charleston	5 345	7,027	1 682	38
Georgetown	6 732	8,398	1 666	39
Spartanburg 3	6,989	8 650	1 661	40
Barnberg 1	5 855	7,515	1 660	41
Laurens 56	5 457	7 113	1 656	42
Chester	5 547	7 199	1 652	43
Lexington 2	6 139	7 770	1 631	44

TABLE 93 (Continued)
INCREASE IN REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL, STATE,
AND FEDERAL SOURCES FROM 1997-98 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically			Rank
	Local, State, and Federal Revenue Per Pupil			
	1997-98	2001-02	Increase	
Dillon 2	\$5,111	\$6,734	\$1,623	45
Marion 2	5,990	7,585	1,595	46
Spartanburg 1	5,891	7,486	1,595	47
Fairfield	8,373	9,965	1,592	48
Marion 1	5,590	7,161	1,571	49
Laurens 55	5,182	6,744	1,562	50
Spartanburg 6	5,359	6,908	1,549	51
Newberry	5,832	7,454	1,522	52
York 4	5,294	6,793	1,499	53
Dillon 1	5,222	6,703	1,481	54
Greenville	5,046	6,516	1,470	55
Sumter 2	5,252	6,712	1,460	56
Spartanburg 5	6,556	8,016	1,460	57
Greenwood 52	5,691	7,144	1,453	58
Marlboro	5,351	6,784	1,413	59
Barnwell 45	5,311	6,723	1,412	60
Anderson 1	5,199	6,609	1,410	61
York 1	5,660	7,060	1,400	62
Williamsburg	5,893	7,283	1,390	63
Horry	5,975	7,357	1,382	64
Berkeley	5,205	6,568	1,364	65
Lexington 4	5,688	7,024	1,336	66
Anderson 3	5,020	6,351	1,331	67
Greenwood 50	5,723	7,052	1,329	68
Colleton	5,572	6,897	1,325	69
Kershaw	5,334	6,655	1,321	70
York 3	5,496	6,813	1,317	71
Pickens	5,059	6,372	1,313	72
Cherokee	5,773	7,070	1,297	73
Chesterfield	5,469	6,726	1,259	74
Aiken	4,862	6,102	1,240	75
Florence 5	5,838	7,148	1,208	76
Darlington	6,237	7,440	1,203	77
Dorchester 2	4,896	6,197	1,201	78
Lancaster	5,540	6,730	1,190	79
Richland 2	5,833	7,010	1,177	80
Clarendon 3	5,508	6,664	1,156	81
Orangeburg 4	5,979	7,117	1,138	82
Hampton 1	6,055	7,159	1,104	83
Spartanburg 4	5,492	6,556	1,064	84
Spartanburg 2	5,400	6,337	937	85
State Total	\$5,660	\$7,235	\$1,575	
District Median			\$1,652	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 94
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS RECEIVED PER PUPIL
FROM LOCAL SOURCES, 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Abbeville	\$6 742,350	3 709	\$1,818	43
Aiken	36 647,540	23 884	1 534	82
Allendale	4 483,637	1,822	2 481	23
Anderson 1	13 192,381	7 512	1 756	49
Anderson 2	7 022,351	3 589	1,957	37
Anderson 3	4 183 038	2 572	1 630	57
Anderson 4	8 338,689	2 679	3 113	12
Anderson 5	25 143 634	11 118	2,262	28
Barnberg 1	2,268 700	1 671	1,358	68
Barnberg 2	2,266,276	1 063	2 132	30
Barnwell 19	1 415,683	978	1 446	67
Barnwell 29	1 525,805	947	1 611	58
Barnwell 45	3 575,038	2,702	1,323	69
Beaufort	74 672,812	16,496	4 527	3
Berkeley	39 387 027	25 980	1 516	64
Cathoun	5 771,221	1 972	2,927	14
Charleston	107 434 892	41 829	2,568	19
Cherokee	20 895,010	8 822	2,369	25
Chester	11 065,755	6,367	1 738	52
Chesterfield	13 730 630	7,935	1 730	53
Clarendon 1	1 879 359	1,241	1,514	65
Clarendon 2	2 562,919	3 526	727	85
Clarendon 3	955,400	1 189	804	84
Colleton	11 082 582	6 638	1,671	55
Darlington	25 304 636	11 415	2,217	29
Dillon 1	845 588	901	938	83
Dillon 2	4 100,441	3 688	1 112	81
Dillon 3	1 397 811	1 486	941	82
Dorchester 2	25 653,787	16,668	1,539	61
Dorchester 4	7,264 048	2 422	2,999	13
Edgefield	7 155,694	3,926	1,823	42
Fairfield	18,265 575	3 625	5,039	2
Florence 1	27 531 035	13,814	2,022	36
Florence 2	1,298 898	1 082	1,200	76
Florence 3	5,214,292	4 124	1,264	73
Florence 4	1,262,324	1 072	1 196	77
Florence 5	2,217 323	1 438	1,542	60
Georgetown	33 487 102	9,859	3,397	10
Greenville	121 064 035	59 729	2 027	35
Greenwood 50	18 592 684	8 806	2 111	32
Greenwood 51	2,262,411	1 197	1,890	39
Greenwood 52	5 881,243	1 629	3 610	7
Hampton 1	4 040 167	2 604	1 552	59
Hampton 2	2 541,293	1 443	1 761	47

TABLE 94 (Continued)
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS RECEIVED PER PUPIL
FROM LOCAL SOURCES 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Horry	\$97 401 342	28 455	\$3 423	9
Jasper	5,211 784	2,839	1 836	40
Kershaw	16 983,106	9 666	1 757	48
Lancaster	16 056,230	10 801	1 487	66
Laurens 55	10 363 445	5 791	1 790	45
Laurens 56	5 683 368	3 349	1 897	54
Lee	3 691,241	2 869	1,287	71
Lexington 1	44 721 152	17,268	2,590	17
Lexington 2	22 114,061	8 696	2,543	21
Lexington 3	4 782,606	2,264	2,112	31
Lexington 4	4,227 743	3,321	1,273	72
Lexington 5	38 122,380	14 755	2,584	18
McCormick	2 600,260	1 070	2,617	16
Marion 1	3 570 089	3 180	1 123	80
Marion 2	2 508,197	2 153	1 165	78
Marion 7	1 468 628	962	1 527	83
Marlboro	6 468,147	5 139	1,259	74
Newberry	11 744 936	5 751	2,042	34
Oconee	37 091,235	10 071	3,683	6
Orangeburg 3	7,025 590	3,660	1 920	38
Orangeburg 4	7,364 601	4,137	1 780	46
Orangeburg 5	18 460 630	7,298	2,530	22
Pickens	26,304,042	15 758	1 669	56
Richland 1	96,361,840	25 673	3 753	5
Richland 2	40 581 192	17 660	2,298	26
Saluda	3 655 487	2 087	1 752	50
Spartanburg 1	10 490 728	4,383	2,394	24
Spartanburg 2	14 121,035	8 080	1 748	51
Spartanburg 3	10 429 418	3 122	3 341	11
Spartanburg 4	5,234,947	2,852	1,836	41
Spartanburg 5	22,066,238	5 766	3 634	4
Spartanburg 6	23,360 762	9 102	2,567	20
Spartanburg 7	30,671,862	8 510	3 604	8
Sumter 2	10 526 519	9 170	1 148	79
Sumter 17	11,235 567	6 689	1,293	70
Union	8,974,048	4 967	1 807	44
Williamsburg	7,620 837	6 114	1,248	75
York 1	10 185 016	4 968	2,050	33
York 2	26,319 156	4 600	5 722	1
York 3	34 371,359	14 978	2,295	27
York 4	14 683,617	5 506	2 667	15
State Total	\$1 496 717,555	652,433	\$2,294	
District Median			\$1,618	

TABLE 94 (Continued)
 TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS RECEIVED PER PUPIL
 FROM LOCAL SOURCES 2001-02
 BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
York 2	\$26,319,156	4,600	\$5,722	1
Fairfield	18,265,575	3,625	5,039	2
Beaufort	74,672,812	16,496	4,527	3
Spartanburg 5	22,066,236	5,755	3,834	4
Richland 1	96,361,840	25,673	3,753	5
Oconee	37,091,235	10,071	3,683	6
Greenwood 52	5,881,243	1,629	3,610	7
Spartanburg 7	30,671,662	8,510	3,604	8
Horry	97,401,342	28,455	3,423	9
Georgetown	33,487,102	9,659	3,397	10
Spartanburg 3	10,429,418	3,122	3,341	11
Anderson 4	8,338,669	2,679	3,113	12
Dorchester 4	7,264,048	2,422	2,999	13
Calhoun	5,771,221	1,972	2,927	14
York 4	14,683,817	5,506	2,667	15
McCormick	2,800,260	1,070	2,617	16
Lexington 1	44,721,152	17,268	2,590	17
Lexington 5	38,122,380	14,755	2,584	18
Charleston	107,434,892	41,629	2,568	19
Spartanburg 6	23,360,762	9,102	2,567	20
Lexington 2	22,114,081	8,696	2,543	21
Orangeburg 5	18,460,630	7,298	2,530	22
Affandale	4,483,637	1,822	2,461	23
Spartanburg 1	10,490,728	4,363	2,394	24
Cherokee	20,895,010	8,822	2,369	25
Richland 2	40,561,192	17,660	2,298	26
York 3	34,371,359	14,976	2,295	27
Anderson 5	25,143,634	11,118	2,262	28
Darlington	25,304,636	11,415	2,217	29
Bamberg 2	2,266,278	1,063	2,132	30
Lexington 3	4,782,606	2,264	2,112	31
Greenwood 50	18,592,664	8,806	2,111	32
York 1	10,185,016	4,968	2,050	33
Newberry	11,744,936	5,751	2,042	34
Greenville	121,064,035	59,729	2,027	35
Florence 1	27,531,035	13,614	2,022	36
Anderson 2	7,022,351	3,589	1,957	37
Orangeburg 3	7,025,690	3,660	1,920	38
Greenwood 51	2,262,411	1,197	1,890	39
Jasper	5,211,794	2,839	1,836	40
Spartanburg 4	5,234,947	2,852	1,836	41
Edgefield	7,155,694	3,926	1,823	42
Abbeville	6,742,350	3,709	1,818	43
Union	8,974,048	4,967	1,807	44

TABLE 94 (Continued)
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS RECEIVED PER PUPIL
FROM LOCAL SOURCES, 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Laurens 55	\$10,363,445	5,791	\$1,790	45
Orangeburg 4	7,364,601	4,137	1,780	46
Hampton 2	2,541,293	1,443	1,761	47
Kershaw	16,983,108	9,666	1,757	48
Anderson 1	13,192,381	7,512	1,756	49
Saluda	3,655,487	2,087	1,752	50
Spartanburg 2	14,121,035	8,060	1,748	51
Chester	11,065,755	6,367	1,738	52
Chesterfield	13,730,630	7,935	1,730	53
Laurens 58	5,683,388	3,349	1,697	54
Colleton	11,092,582	6,638	1,671	55
Pickens	28,304,042	15,758	1,669	56
Anderson 3	4,193,038	2,572	1,630	57
Barnwell 29	1,525,805	947	1,611	58
Hampton 1	4,040,167	2,604	1,552	59
Florence 5	2,217,323	1,438	1,542	60
Dorchester 2	25,653,767	16,666	1,539	61
Aiken	36,647,540	23,884	1,534	62
Marion 7	1,468,626	962	1,527	63
Berkeley	39,387,027	25,980	1,516	64
Clarendon 1	1,879,358	1,241	1,514	65
Lancaster	16,056,230	10,801	1,487	66
Barnwell 19	1,415,663	879	1,446	67
Barnberg 1	2,268,700	1,671	1,358	68
Barnwell 45	3,575,038	2,702	1,323	69
Sumter 17	11,235,567	8,689	1,293	70
Lee	3,691,241	2,869	1,287	71
Lexington 4	4,227,743	3,321	1,273	72
Florence 3	5,214,292	4,124	1,264	73
Marlboro	6,468,147	5,139	1,259	74
Williamsburg	7,620,837	6,114	1,246	75
Florence 2	1,298,898	1,062	1,200	76
Florence 4	1,282,324	1,072	1,196	77
Marion 2	2,506,197	2,153	1,165	78
Sumter 2	10,526,519	9,170	1,148	79
Marion 1	3,570,069	3,180	1,123	80
Dillon 2	4,100,441	3,688	1,112	81
Dillon 3	1,397,811	1,486	941	82
Dillon 1	845,588	901	938	83
Clarendon 3	955,400	1,189	804	84
Clarendon 2	2,562,919	3,526	727	85
State Total	\$1,496,717,555	652,435	\$2,294	
District Median			\$1,818	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 95
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS AND DEBT SERVICE RECEIVED
PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES, 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Abbeville	\$8,276,044	3,709	\$2,231	44
Aiken	48,026,903	23,884	2,011	55
Allendale	4,908,871	1,822	2,694	29
Anderson 1	18,051,815	7,512	2,137	48
Anderson 2	9,659,068	3,589	2,691	30
Anderson 3	5,209,015	2,572	2,025	53
Anderson 4	9,729,201	2,679	3,632	12
Anderson 5	31,185,278	11,118	2,803	26
Bamberg 1	2,878,735	1,671	1,722	71
Bamberg 2	2,710,442	1,063	2,550	34
Barnwell 19	1,817,515	979	1,857	65
Barnwell 29	1,584,307	947	1,673	75
Barnwell 45	4,566,956	2,702	1,690	74
Beaufort	93,318,777	16,496	5,657	2
Berkeley	54,956,268	25,980	2,115	49
Calhoun	6,592,282	1,972	3,343	17
Charleston	140,686,051	41,829	3,363	16
Cherokee	28,129,270	8,822	2,962	22
Chester	14,771,053	6,367	2,320	41
Chesterfield	15,475,659	7,835	1,950	60
Clarendon 1	2,957,502	1,241	2,383	38
Clarendon 2	3,226,370	3,526	915	85
Clarendon 3	1,347,742	1,189	1,134	82
Colleton	12,468,980	6,638	1,878	64
Darlington	27,494,293	11,415	2,409	36
Dillon 1	935,277	901	1,038	83
Dillon 2	4,475,030	3,688	1,213	81
Dillon 3	1,542,378	1,486	1,038	84
Dorchester 2	32,049,907	16,666	1,923	62
Dorchester 4	8,653,028	2,422	3,573	14
Edgefield	8,714,324	3,826	2,220	45
Fairfield	19,346,052	3,625	5,337	3
Florence 1	31,879,474	13,614	2,342	39
Florence 2	1,884,002	1,082	1,741	69
Florence 3	5,667,708	4,124	1,374	77
Florence 4	2,248,390	1,072	2,097	50
Florence 5	2,634,283	1,438	1,832	67
Georgetown	40,538,540	9,859	4,112	8
Greenville	182,822,278	59,729	3,061	21
Greenwood 50	20,568,112	8,808	2,336	40
Greenwood 51	2,372,795	1,197	1,982	57
Greenwood 52	8,546,835	1,629	4,019	9
Hampton 1	4,466,874	2,604	1,715	72
Hampton 2	2,814,743	1,443	1,951	59

TABLE 95 (Continued)
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS AND DEBT SERVICE RECEIVED
PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Horry	\$121,067,253	26,455	\$4,265	6
Jasper	8,478,090	2,839	2,282	43
Kershaw	21,415,041	9,668	2,216	48
Lancaster	22,200,781	10,801	2,055	51
Laurens 55	12,507,247	5,791	2,160	47
Laurens 56	6,772,665	3,349	2,022	54
Lee	5,317,629	2,969	1,854	66
Lexington 1	50,618,969	17,268	2,831	24
Lexington 2	25,456,978	8,698	2,827	25
Lexington 3	6,326,569	2,264	2,794	27
Lexington 4	5,689,239	3,321	1,713	73
Lexington 5	52,219,256	14,755	3,539	15
McCormick	2,852,985	1,070	2,688	32
Marion 1	4,164,583	3,180	1,306	79
Marion 2	2,906,285	2,153	1,350	78
Marion 7	1,868,015	962	1,942	61
Marlboro	8,587,168	5,139	1,671	76
Newberry	15,982,390	5,751	2,776	28
Oconee	42,014,601	10,071	4,172	7
Orangeburg 3	8,772,059	3,660	2,397	37
Orangeburg 4	11,088,235	4,137	2,680	31
Orangeburg 5	21,514,346	7,298	2,948	23
Pickens	31,354,247	15,768	1,990	56
Richland 1	114,329,563	26,673	4,453	4
Richland 2	58,852,978	17,660	3,333	18
Seluda	4,835,948	2,087	2,317	42
Spartanburg 1	11,371,787	4,363	2,595	33
Spartanburg 2	16,366,248	8,080	2,026	52
Spartanburg 3	11,268,952	3,122	3,610	13
Spartanburg 4	5,618,841	2,852	1,970	58
Spartanburg 5	24,870,653	5,765	4,322	5
Spartanburg 6	29,050,727	9,102	3,192	19
Spartanburg 7	32,835,162	8,510	3,858	11
Sumter 2	16,273,616	9,170	1,775	68
Sumter 17	16,086,082	8,689	1,738	70
Union	9,525,332	4,967	1,918	63
Williamsburg	7,745,160	6,114	1,267	80
York 1	12,535,642	4,968	2,523	35
York 2	33,619,543	4,600	7,309	1
York 3	47,677,465	14,976	3,184	20
York 4	21,349,835	5,606	3,878	10
State Total	\$1,886,546,749	652,435	\$2,892	
<i>District Median</i>			\$2,282	

TABLE 95 (Continued)
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS AND DEBT SERVICE RECEIVED
PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES, 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
York 2	\$33 619 543	4 600	\$7,309	1
Beaufort	93 318 777	16 496	5,657	2
Fairfield	19,346 052	3 625	5,337	3
Richland 1	114 329 553	25 673	4 453	4
Spartanburg 5	24 870 653	5 755	4,322	5
Horry	121 087,263	28 455	4,255	6
Oconee	42 014 801	10 071	4 172	7
Georgetown	40 538 540	9,859	4 112	8
Greenwood 52	6 546 835	1 629	4,019	9
York 4	21,349 835	5,508	3 878	10
Spartanburg 7	32,835 182	8,510	3,858	11
Anderson 4	9 729,201	2,679	3 632	12
Spartanburg 3	11,268,952	3 122	3 610	13
Dorchester 4	8,653 026	2 422	3 573	14
Lexington 5	52,219,256	14 755	3 539	15
Charleston	140 686 051	41,829	3,363	16
Calhoun	6,592 282	1,972	3 343	17
Richland 2	58,852 976	17 660	3 333	18
Spartanburg 6	29,050 727	9 102	3 182	19
York 3	47,877 465	14,876	3 184	20
Greenville	182,822,278	59 729	3 061	21
Cherokee	28 129,270	8,822	2,962	22
Orangeburg 5	21,514 346	7,298	2,948	23
Lexington 1	50 619 969	17,268	2,931	24
Lexington 2	25 456 978	8 696	2,827	25
Anderson 5	31 165,278	11 118	2,803	26
Lexington 3	6 325,559	2,264	2,794	27
Newberry	15 962,390	5,751	2,776	28
Allendale	4 908,871	1,822	2,694	29
Anderson 2	9 658,068	3,589	2,691	30
Orangeburg 4	11 088,235	4 137	2,680	31
McCormick	2,852,985	1 070	2,668	32
Spartanburg 1	11,371 787	4,383	2,595	33
Bamberg 2	2,710 442	1 083	2,550	34
York 1	12 535,642	4,968	2,523	35
Darlington	27 494,293	11 415	2,409	36
Orangeburg 3	8 772,059	3 660	2,397	37
Clarendon 1	2,957,502	1,241	2,383	38
Florence 1	31,879 474	13 614	2,342	39
Greenwood 50	20,568 112	8,806	2,338	40
Chester	14 771 053	6,367	2,320	41
Saluda	4 835 948	2,087	2,317	42
Jasper	6,478 090	2 839	2,282	43
Abbeville	8,276,044	3 709	2,231	44

TABLE 95 (Continued)
TAXES FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS AND DEBT SERVICE RECEIVED
PER PUPIL FROM LOCAL SOURCES 2001-02
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Local Taxes for Current Operations	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Local Taxes Per Pupil For Current Operations	Rank
Edgefield	\$8,714,324	3,928	\$2,220	45
Kershaw	21,415,041	9,666	2,218	46
Laurens 55	12,507,247	5,791	2,160	47
Anderson 1	18,051,815	7,512	2,137	48
Berkeley	54,958,268	25,980	2,118	49
Florence 4	2,248,390	1,072	2,097	50
Lancaster	22,200,761	10,801	2,055	51
Spartanburg 2	18,368,246	8,060	2,028	52
Anderson 3	5,209,015	2,572	2,025	53
Laurens 56	6,772,865	3,349	2,022	54
Aiken	48,028,903	23,884	2,011	55
Pickens	31,354,247	15,758	1,990	56
Greenwood 51	2,372,795	1,197	1,982	57
Spartanburg 4	5,618,841	2,852	1,970	58
Hampton 2	2,814,743	1,443	1,961	59
Chesterfield	15,475,659	7,935	1,950	60
Marion 7	1,888,015	932	1,942	61
Dorchester 2	32,049,907	16,668	1,923	62
Union	9,525,332	4,967	1,918	63
Colleton	12,468,980	6,638	1,878	64
Barnwell 18	1,817,515	979	1,857	65
Lee	5,317,829	2,869	1,854	66
Florence 5	2,634,263	1,438	1,832	67
Sumter 2	18,273,816	9,170	1,775	68
Florence 2	1,884,002	1,082	1,741	69
Sumter 17	15,088,082	8,689	1,736	70
Bamberg 1	2,878,735	1,671	1,722	71
Hampton 1	4,488,874	2,604	1,715	72
Lexington 4	5,689,239	3,321	1,713	73
Barnwell 45	4,568,956	2,702	1,690	74
Barnwell 29	1,584,307	947	1,673	75
Marlboro	8,587,168	5,139	1,671	76
Florence 3	5,687,708	4,124	1,374	77
Marion 2	2,908,285	2,153	1,350	78
Marion 1	4,154,583	3,180	1,308	79
Williamsburg	7,745,180	6,114	1,287	80
Dillon 2	4,475,030	3,688	1,213	81
Clarendon 3	1,347,742	1,189	1,134	82
Dillon 1	935,277	901	1,038	83
Dillon 3	1,542,376	1,486	1,038	84
Clarendon 2	3,228,370	3,628	915	85
State Total	\$1,888,548,740	652,433	\$2,892	
District Median			\$2,282	

*See References for Tables

TABLE 96
REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Listed Alphabetically			2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Capital Projects and Debt Service			
Abbeville	\$3 881 999	\$1,555 657	\$5 437,656	3,709	\$1 466	18
Aiken	15 006 428	11 517 028	26 523 456	23 884	1 111	32
Allendale	69,213	490 822	560,035	1 822	307	79
Anderson 1	1 949 008	3 064 732	5 013 740	7 512	667	65
Anderson 2	1 379 964	2 904 740	4,284 704	3 589	1 184	30
Anderson 3	3 487 637	1 142 349	4 629,886	2 572	1 800	9
Anderson 4	1 191 010	1 528 599	2 719 609	2 679	1 015	42
Anderson 5	6 924,245	6,557,304	13 481,549	11 118	1,213	27
Bamberg 1	139 872	680 462	820 334	1 671	491	74
Bamberg 2	231,326	486,019	717 345	1 063	675	63
Barnwell 19	233 565	440,333	673,898	979	688	60
Barnwell 29	1,279 967	67 744	1,347 711	947	1 423	19
Barnwell 45	1 371 861	1 063 053	2 434,914	2 702	901	44
Beaufort	10 591 989	19,277 878	29,869,867	16 496	1 811	8
Berkeley	5 197 566	16 639 514	21 837 080	25 980	841	45
Calhoun	25 368	912,814	938 182	1 972	476	75
Charleston	29 120,283	34 679 401	63 799 684	41 829	1 525	15
Cherokee	55 018	5 512,594	5 567 612	8 822	631	68
Chester	482 137	4 096 423	4 578 560	6 367	719	58
Chesterfield	6 866,264	1 896 464	8,762 728	7 935	1 104	33
Clarendon 1	831 345	1 090,164	1,921 509	1,241	1,548	14
Clarendon 2	128 026	672,483	800 510	3,526	227	82
Clarendon 3	1 785 580	399 160	2,184 760	1 189	1 637	6
Colleton	8 844 788	1 475,092	10,319 890	6 638	1 555	13
Darlington	3 944,902	2 337,875	6,282 777	11 415	550	71
Dillon 1	307 112	99,894	407 006	901	452	76
Dillon 2	2 054 496	417,209	2,471 705	3,688	670	64
Dillon 3	1 082 837	161 013	1,243,850	1 486	837	47
Dorchester 2	6 510 174	6 910,513	13 420 687	16,666	805	49
Dorchester 4	1 459 091	1 508,015	2,965 106	2,422	1,224	26
Edgefield	2 379,589	1 680,230	4 059 819	3,926	1 034	40
Fairfield	294,399	1 140 403	1 434,802	3,625	396	78
Florence 1	1 846 871	4,864 154	6 711 025	13 614	493	73
Florence 2	884 564	844 695	1 509 159	1 082	1 395	21
Florence 3	588 563	538 775	1 127,338	4 124	273	81
Florence 4	48,962	1,055 717	1 104 679	1 072	1 030	41
Florence 5	1 050 462	469,825	1 520,287	1 438	1 057	37
Georgetown	14 158,907	7 507,662	21 666 569	9,859	2 198	3
Greenville	8 834 074	65,669,843	74 503 917	59 729	1,247	25
Greenwood 50	2 838,810	2 535 072	5 373 882	8 806	610	69
Greenwood 51	43 438	132 702	176,140	1 197	147	83
Greenwood 52	1 181 709	666 079	1,847 788	1 629	1 134	31
Hampton 1	803 588	496 102	1,299 690	2 604	499	72
Hampton 2	638,254	302 405	940 659	1 443	652	66

TABLE 96 (Continued)
REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically						
District	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Capital Projects and Debt Service	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$17,554,454	\$24,811,378	\$42,365,832	28,455	\$1,489	17
Jasper	595,544	1,354,865	1,950,409	2,839	687	61
Kershaw	6,642,732	4,902,299	11,545,031	9,668	1,194	29
Lancaster	11,093,200	6,658,990	17,752,190	10,801	1,644	12
Laurens 55	1,544,833	2,195,547	3,740,380	5,791	646	67
Laurens 56	1,526,090	1,238,208	2,764,298	3,349	825	48
Lee	598,038	1,630,454	2,228,490	2,869	777	51
Lexington 1	6,352,857	6,454,668	12,807,525	17,268	742	56
Lexington 2	2,918,829	3,694,717	6,613,546	8,696	761	52
Lexington 3	1,198,855	1,678,016	2,876,871	2,264	1,271	24
Lexington 4	1,841,183	1,653,185	3,494,368	3,321	1,052	38
Lexington 5	12,082,899	14,713,207	26,776,106	14,755	1,815	7
McCormick	8,443	60,953	69,396	1,070	65	85
Marion 1	4,090,541	660,364	4,750,905	3,180	1,494	16
Marion 2	3,105,822	465,795	3,571,617	2,153	1,659	11
Marion 7	3,108,729	411,133	3,519,862	962	3,659	1
Marlboro	2,452,919	2,265,626	4,718,545	5,139	918	43
Newberry	1,685,148	4,675,746	6,340,892	5,751	1,103	35
Oconee	1,935,793	5,237,419	7,173,212	10,071	712	59
Orangeburg 3	864,538	1,907,852	2,772,390	3,660	757	53
Orangeburg 4	1,689,348	4,009,831	5,699,177	4,137	1,378	22
Orangeburg 5	10,198,612	3,382,173	13,580,785	7,298	1,861	5
Pickens	1,565,367	5,551,396	7,116,763	15,758	452	77
Richland 1	7,604,800	19,238,678	26,843,478	25,673	1,046	39
Richland 2	5,388,232	18,310,552	23,698,784	17,660	1,342	23
Saluda	989,516	1,313,401	2,302,917	2,087	1,103	34
Spartanburg 1	4,364,127	935,898	5,300,025	4,383	1,209	28
Spartanburg 2	3,735,377	2,377,449	6,112,826	8,080	757	54
Spartanburg 3	1,217,400	917,115	2,134,515	3,122	684	62
Spartanburg 4	409,368	429,853	839,019	2,852	294	80
Spartanburg 5	1,315,558	2,971,030	4,286,588	5,755	745	55
Spartanburg 6	974,187	6,178,260	7,152,457	9,102	786	50
Spartanburg 7	13,626,879	2,539,811	16,166,690	8,510	1,900	4
Sumter 2	7,045,572	5,774,131	12,819,703	9,170	1,398	46
Sumter 17	3,403,122	3,875,185	7,278,307	6,689	838	20
Union	2,389,093	639,794	3,028,887	4,967	610	70
Williamsburg	621,748	149,369	771,117	6,114	126	84
York 1	1,097,142	2,525,554	3,622,696	4,968	729	57
York 2	2,687,567	7,444,291	10,131,858	4,600	2,203	2
York 3	2,665,070	13,511,814	16,176,884	14,976	1,080	36
York 4	2,634,111	8,712,294	9,346,405	5,506	1,697	10
State Total	\$308,786,725	\$412,745,021	\$721,531,748	652,433	\$1,106	
<i>District Median</i>					\$918	

TABLE 96 (Continued)
REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically				Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Capital Projects and Debt Service	2001-02 ADM (K-12)		
Marion 7	\$3 108 729	\$411 133	\$3 519 862	962	\$3 659	1
York 2	2,687,567	7 444,291	10 131,858	4 600	2,203	2
Georgetown	14 158,907	7 507 662	21 666,569	9 859	2 198	3
Spartanburg 7	13 626,879	2 539 811	16 166 690	8 510	1 900	4
Orangeburg 5	10 198 612	3 382 173	13 580 785	7,298	1 861	5
Clarendon 3	1 785 580	399 160	2 184 750	1 189	1 837	6
Lexington 5	12 062,899	14 713,207	26 776 106	14 755	1 815	7
Beaufort	10 591 889	19,277 878	29 869 867	16 496	1 811	8
Anderson 3	3 487 637	1 142,349	4 629 988	2 572	1 800	9
York 4	2,634 111	6 712,294	9,346,405	5 506	1 697	10
Marion 2	3,105 622	465 795	3 571 417	2,153	1 658	11
Lancaster	11 093,200	6 658 990	17 752 190	10,801	1 644	12
Colleton	8,844 798	1 475 092	10 319 890	6 638	1 655	13
Clarendon 1	831 345	1 090 164	1 921 509	1,241	1 548	14
Charleston	29 120,283	34,679 401	63 799 684	41,629	1 525	15
Marion 1	4 090 541	660 364	4 750 905	3 180	1 494	16
Horry	17 554 454	24,811 378	42,365 832	28 455	1 489	17
Abbeville	3,881 999	1,555 657	5 437 656	3 709	1 466	18
Barnwell 29	1,279 967	67 744	1 347 711	947	1 423	19
Sumter 2	7 045,572	5 774 131	12,819 703	9 170	1 398	20
Florence 2	864 564	644 595	1 509 159	1 082	1 395	21
Orangeburg 4	1 689,346	4 009 831	5 699 177	4 137	1,378	22
Richland 2	5,388,232	18 310 552	23,696 784	17 660	1 342	23
Lexington 3	1 198 855	1 878 016	2 876,871	2,284	1,271	24
Greenville	8 834 074	65 669,843	74 503,917	59 729	1,247	25
Dorchester 4	1 459 091	1 506,015	2,965 106	2 422	1,224	26
Anderson 5	6 924,245	6 557,304	13,481,549	11 118	1,213	27
Spartanburg 1	4 364 127	935,898	5 300 025	4 383	1,209	28
Kershaw	6 842 732	4 902,299	11 545,031	9 666	1 194	29
Anderson 2	1 379,964	2 904 740	4,284 704	3,589	1 194	30
Greenwood 52	1 181 709	668,079	1 847 788	1 629	1 134	31
Aiken	15 006 428	11 517,028	26 523 458	23 884	1 111	32
Chesterfield	6 866,264	1 896 484	8 762,728	7 935	1 104	33
Saluda	989 518	1 313 401	2,302 917	2 087	1 103	34
Newberry	1 665 146	4 675,746	6,340 892	5 751	1 103	35
York 3	2,685 070	13,511 814	16 178 884	14 976	1 080	36
Florence 5	1 050 462	469 825	1 520,287	1 438	1 057	37
Lexington 4	1 841 183	1 653 185	3 494 368	3,321	1 052	38
Richland 1	7 604,800	19,238 678	26,843 478	25 873	1 046	39
Edgefield	2 379,589	1 680,230	4 059 819	3 826	1 034	40
Florence 4	48,962	1 055,717	1 104 679	1 072	1 030	41
Anderson 4	1 191 010	1 528 589	2 719 609	2 679	1 015	42
Marlboro	2 452 919	2,265 626	4 718 545	5 139	918	43
Barnwell 45	1 371 861	1 063,053	2 434 914	2 702	901	44

TABLE 96 (Continued)
REVENUE RECEIVED PER PUPIL FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
AND DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically				Revenue Per Pupil	Rank
	Capital Projects	Debt Service	Capital Projects and Debt Service	2001-02 ADM (K-12)		
Berkeley	\$5 187 568	\$16 639,514	\$21 837 080	25,980	\$841	45
Sumter 17	3,403 122	3 975,185	7,278,307	8 689	838	48
Dillon 3	1,062,837	161 013	1,243,850	1 486	837	47
Laurens 56	1,526,090	1,238,206	2,764,296	3 349	825	48
Dorchester 2	6,510 174	6,910 513	13,420,687	16 666	805	49
Spartanburg 6	974 197	6 178,260	7 152 457	9 102	786	50
Lee	598 036	1 630 454	2,228,490	2 869	777	51
Lexington 2	2 918,829	3,694 717	6,613,546	8 696	761	52
Orangeburg 3	864,536	1,907,852	2,772,388	3 660	757	53
Spartanburg 2	3 735,377	2 377 449	6 112,826	8 080	757	54
Spartanburg 5	1,315,558	2,971 030	4,286,588	5 755	745	55
Lexington 1	6,352,857	6 454 668	12,807 525	17,268	742	56
York 1	1 097 142	2 525 554	3 622 696	4 968	729	57
Chester	482 137	4 096 423	4 578 560	6 367	719	58
Oconee	1,935 783	5,237 419	7 173,212	10 071	712	59
Barnwell 19	233 565	440,333	673,898	979	688	60
Jasper	595,544	1,354,865	1 950 409	2 839	687	61
Spartanburg 3	1,217 400	917 115	2,134,515	3 122	684	62
Bamberg 2	231,326	486,019	717,345	1,063	675	63
Dillon 2	2,054 498	417,209	2,471 705	3 688	670	64
Anderson 1	1,949,006	3 064 732	5,013 740	7 512	667	65
Hampton 2	638,254	302,405	940 659	1 443	652	66
Laurens 55	1,544,833	2 195 547	3,740,380	5,791	646	67
Cherokee	55 018	5 512 594	5,567 812	8 822	631	68
Greenwood 50	2,838 810	2 535 072	5,373 882	8,806	610	69
Union	2,389 093	639 794	3 028 887	4 967	610	70
Darlington	3 944,902	2 337 875	6,282 777	11 415	550	71
Hampton 1	603,588	496,102	1,299 690	2 604	499	72
Florence 1	1 848,871	4 864 154	6 711 025	13 614	493	73
Bamberg 1	139,872	680 482	820 334	1 671	491	74
Calhoun	25,368	912,814	938 182	1 972	476	75
Dillon 1	307 112	99,894	407 006	901	452	76
Pickens	1 565,367	5 551 398	7 116,763	15 758	452	77
Fairfield	294,399	1 140 403	1 434,802	3 625	396	78
Allendale	69,213	490 822	560 035	1 822	307	79
Spartanburg 4	409 366	429 653	839,019	2,852	294	80
Florence 3	588 583	538 775	1 127,338	4 124	273	81
Clarendon 2	128 028	672,493	800,519	3,526	227	82
Greenwood 51	43,438	132,702	178 140	1 197	147	83
Williamsburg	621 748	149,369	771 117	6 114	126	84
McCormick	8,443	60,963	69 396	1 070	65	85
State Total	\$308 788,725	\$412,745,021	\$721,531 746	652,435	\$1 106	
District Median					\$918	

*See References for Tables

TABLE 97
 ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Valuation Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$51,405,955	\$13,860	53
Aiken	430,801,821	18,037	25
Allendale	28,148,768	14,351	48
Anderson 1	123,035,282	16,378	33
Anderson 2	47,411,265	13,210	58
Anderson 3	34,609,270	13,456	56
Anderson 4	63,559,930	23,725	13
Anderson 5	213,470,196	19,200	21
Bamberg 1	15,948,750	9,544	77
Bamberg 2	12,826,470	12,068	63
Barnwell 19	8,178,000	8,353	81
Barnwell 29	12,764,000	13,478	55
Barnwell 45	29,749,320	11,010	70
Beaufort	860,859,973	52,188	1
Berkeley	414,745,058	15,064	35
Calhoun	9,681,357	4,909	84
Charleston	1,451,541,768	34,702	6
Cherokee	147,274,479	16,694	31
Chester	99,976,870	15,702	37
Chesterfield	117,119,851	14,760	48
Clarendon 1	24,635,080	19,851	19
Clarendon 2	39,922,960	11,322	68
Clarendon 3	7,421,070	8,241	83
Colleton	117,595,804	17,716	27
Darlington	190,908,828	18,724	30
Dillon 1	7,676,890	8,520	80
Dillon 2	41,164,258	11,162	68
Dillon 3	14,694,805	9,889	74
Dorchester 2	220,983,008	13,260	57
Dorchester 4	44,348,034	18,310	24
Edgefield	58,658,915	14,916	44
Fairfield	128,634,581	34,908	5
Florence 1	292,253,007	21,487	15
Florence 2	13,188,049	12,189	62
Florence 3	45,708,242	11,083	69
Florence 4	12,827,447	11,988	64
Florence 5	13,972,118	9,716	76
Georgetown	331,381,978	33,612	7
Greenville	1,569,514,238	28,277	9
Greenwood 50	151,213,839	17,172	29
Greenwood 51	12,705,888	10,615	71
Greenwood 52	28,789,772	16,448	32
Hampton 1	25,657,658	9,853	75
Hampton 2	12,608,620	8,738	78

TABLE 97 (Continued)
 ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically			
District	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Valuation Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$1 068,562,282	\$38,607	3
Jasper	56 055	20	85
Kershaw	158,000 000	16,346	34
Lancaster	170 415 809	15 778	36
Laurens 55	88,348 167	15,256	41
Laurens 56	50,200 000	14,990	43
Lee	28 691 048	10,349	72
Lexington 1	270 640,270	15,873	39
Lexington 2	196,233 777	22,566	14
Lexington 3	32,383 110	14,303	49
Lexington 4	24,297 060	7,316	82
Lexington 5	294 784 764	19 979	18
McCormick	29 174 310	27,266	8
Manon 1	39,928 135	12,556	59
Marion 2	21,316 151	9,901	73
Marion 7	8 922 648	9,275	78
Marlboro	61 028 683	11,876	66
Newberry	89,848 570	15,623	40
Oconee	388,888 829	36,639	4
Orangeburg 3	45,860,204	12,530	61
Orangeburg 4	64,896,997	15,887	38
Orangeburg 5	128,297 888	17,580	28
Pickens	312,205 133	19,812	20
Richland 1	623,566,210	24,289	11
Richland 2	313,279 838	17 740	26
Seluda	30,863 508	14,788	45
Spartanburg 1	65 768 471	15,005	42
Spartanburg 2	113,824 474	14,087	50
Spartanburg 3	57 449,547	16,402	23
Spartanburg 4	38,873,375	13,630	54
Spartanburg 5	144,207,575	25,058	10
Spartanburg 6	193 060,330	21,211	16
Spartanburg 7	182,866 183	19 138	22
Sumter 17	125,030 730	14,390	47
Sumter 2	108,152 310	11,794	67
Union	69 618,260	14,016	52
Williamsburg	76 845,424	12,536	60
York 1	69 640 548	14,018	51
York 2	236,853,927	51,490	2
York 3	317 043,492	21 170	17
York 4	131,548,177	23,892	12
State Total	\$14,035 735,613	\$21,613	
District Median		\$14,990	

TABLE 97 (Continued)
 ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically			
District	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Valuation Per Pupil	Rank
Beaufort	\$880,859,973	\$52,186	1
York 2	238,853,927	51,490	2
Horry	1,098,562,282	38,607	3
Oconee	368,988,829	36,639	4
Fairfield	126,534,561	34,908	5
Charleston	1,451,541,768	34,702	6
Georgetown	331,381,976	33,612	7
McCormack	29,174,310	27,266	8
Greenville	1,569,514,236	26,277	9
Spartanburg 5	144,207,575	25,058	10
Richland 1	623,566,210	24,289	11
York 4	131,548,177	23,892	12
Anderson 4	63,559,930	23,725	13
Lexington 2	196,233,777	22,566	14
Florence 1	292,253,007	21,467	15
Spartanburg 6	193,060,330	21,211	16
York 3	317,043,492	21,170	17
Lexington 5	294,784,764	19,979	18
Clarendon 1	24,635,080	19,851	19
Pickens	312,205,133	19,812	20
Anderson 5	213,470,196	19,200	21
Spartanburg 7	162,868,183	18,138	22
Spartanburg 3	57,448,547	18,402	23
Dorchester 4	44,346,034	18,310	24
Aiken	430,801,821	18,037	25
Richland 2	313,279,938	17,740	26
Colleton	117,595,804	17,718	27
Orangeburg 5	128,297,886	17,580	28
Greenwood 50	151,213,839	17,172	29
Darlington	190,906,628	16,724	30
Cherokee	147,274,479	16,694	31
Greenwood 52	28,789,772	16,446	32
Anderson 1	123,035,282	16,378	33
Kershaw	158,000,000	16,346	34
Berkeley	414,745,058	15,964	35
Lancaster	170,415,809	15,778	36
Chester	99,976,870	15,702	37
Orangeburg 4	64,896,997	15,687	38
Lexington 1	270,640,270	15,673	39
Newberry	89,848,570	15,623	40
Laurens 55	88,346,167	15,256	41
Spartanburg 1	65,768,471	15,005	42
Laurens 58	50,200,000	14,990	43
Edgefield	58,556,915	14,915	44

TABLE 97 (Continued)
 ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically			
District	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Valuation Per Pupil	Rank
Saluda	\$30,853,508	\$14,788	45
Chesterfield	117,119,851	14,760	46
Sumter 17	125,030,730	14,390	47
Alendale	28,148,768	14,351	48
Lexington 3	32,383,110	14,303	49
Spartanburg 2	113,824,474	14,087	50
York 1	69,640,548	14,018	51
Union	69,618,260	14,018	52
Abbeville	51,405,955	13,860	53
Spartanburg 4	38,873,375	13,630	54
Barnwell 28	12,784,000	13,478	55
Anderson 3	34,609,270	13,456	56
Dorchester 2	220,883,009	13,260	62
Anderson 2	47,411,265	13,210	57
Marion 1	39,928,135	12,556	58
Williamsburg	78,645,424	12,536	59
Orangeburg 3	45,860,204	12,530	60
Florence 2	13,188,049	12,169	61
Bamberg 2	12,826,470	12,068	63
Florence 4	12,827,447	11,866	64
Marlboro	61,028,683	11,876	65
Sumter 2	108,152,310	11,794	66
Clarendon 2	39,922,960	11,322	67
Dillon 2	41,164,258	11,162	68
Florence 3	45,708,242	11,063	69
Barnwell 45	29,749,320	11,010	70
Greenwood 51	12,705,888	10,615	71
Lee	29,691,048	10,349	72
Marion 2	21,318,151	9,901	73
Dillon 3	14,694,806	9,889	74
Hampton 1	25,657,659	9,853	75
Florence 5	13,972,118	9,716	76
Bamberg 1	15,948,750	9,544	77
Marion 7	8,922,648	9,275	78
Hampton 2	12,606,620	8,736	80
Dillon 1	7,676,890	8,520	79
Barnwell 19	8,178,000	8,353	81
Lexington 4	24,297,060	7,318	82
Clarendon 3	7,421,070	6,241	83
Calhoun	9,681,357	4,909	84
Jasper	58,055	20	85
State Total	\$14,035,735,813	\$21,513	
District Median		\$14,990	

*See "Reference for Tables"

TABLE 98
CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL FROM 1991-92 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Assessed Valuation 1991-92	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Change	Rank
Abbeville	\$10,473	\$13,860	\$3,387	68
Aiken	11,643	18,037	6,394	26
Alfordale	9,247	14,351	5,104	47
Anderson 1	10,660	16,378	5,718	38
Anderson 2	9,884	13,210	3,346	67
Anderson 3	13,954	13,456	-498	77
Anderson 4	16,882	23,725	6,843	20
Anderson 5	12,899	19,200	6,301	29
Bamberg 1	5,944	9,544	3,600	63
Bamberg 2	6,577	12,066	5,489	41
Barnwell 19	4,745	8,353	3,608	62
Barnwell 29	9,519	13,478	3,959	60
Barnwell 45	7,285	11,010	3,745	61
Beaufort	33,268	52,186	18,920	1
Berkeley	8,302	15,964	7,662	15
Calhoun	22,897	4,909	17,888	84
Charleston	16,874	34,702	17,828	2
Cherokee	12,734	16,694	3,860	59
Chester	9,609	15,702	6,093	32
Chesterfield	9,526	14,760	5,234	45
Clarendon 1	10,230	19,851	9,621	9
Clarendon 2	8,061	11,322	5,261	44
Clarendon 3	4,329	6,241	1,912	73
Colleton	10,459	17,716	7,257	18
Darlington	14,444	16,724	2,280	71
Dillon 1	5,060	8,520	3,460	64
Dillon 2	6,371	11,162	4,791	52
Dillon 3	5,368	9,889	4,521	53
Dorchester 2	10,667	13,260	2,693	70
Dorchester 4	11,740	18,310	6,570	24
Edgefield	8,094	14,915	6,821	21
Fairfield	26,307	34,906	8,599	11
Florence 1	12,744	21,467	8,723	10
Florence 2	7,158	12,189	5,033	48
Florence 3	5,737	11,083	5,346	42
Florence 4	5,833	11,968	6,033	33
Florence 5	9,368	9,718	348	75
Georgetown	16,904	33,812	16,708	4
Greenville	15,930	26,277	10,347	8
Greenwood 50	11,904	17,172	5,268	43
Greenwood 51	6,467	10,615	4,148	58
Greenwood 52	18,397	18,448	1,951	78
Hampton 1	6,958	9,853	2,895	69
Hampton 2	6,813	8,738	1,923	72

TABLE 98 (Continued)
CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL FROM 1991-92 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Assessed Valuation 1991-92	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Change	Rank
Horry	\$24,912	\$38,607	\$13,695	6
Jasper	8,227	20	-8,207	83
Kershaw	12,231	16,346	4,115	57
Lancaster	9,165	15,778	6,613	23
Laurens 55	9,715	15,258	5,541	40
Laurens 56	10,524	14,890	4,466	54
Lee	5,427	10,349	4,922	49
Lexington 1	8,989	15,673	6,684	22
Lexington 2	12,013	22,566	10,553	7
Lexington 3	8,031	14,303	6,272	30
Lexington 4	9,397	7,318	2,081	79
Lexington 5	11,867	19,979	8,112	12
McCormick	10,189	27,268	17,077	3
Marion 1	6,585	12,556	5,971	34
Marion 2	5,009	9,901	4,892	50
Marion 7	8,936	9,275	339	76
Marlboro	5,548	11,878	6,328	27
Newberry	10,014	15,623	5,609	39
Oconee	20,151	36,639	16,488	5
Orangeburg 3	15,520	12,530	2,990	81
Orangeburg 4	17,845	15,687	2,158	80
Orangeburg 6	23,737	17,580	-6,157	82
Pickens	12,728	19,812	7,084	19
Richland 1	16,663	24,289	7,626	16
Richland 2	11,423	17,740	6,317	28
Saluda	8,634	14,788	6,154	31
Spartanburg 1	10,128	15,005	4,877	51
Spartanburg 2	9,629	14,067	4,438	55
Spartanburg 3	16,861	18,402	1,541	74
Spartanburg 4	10,635	13,630	2,995	68
Spartanburg 5	17,598	25,058	7,460	17
Spartanburg 6	17,208	21,211	4,003	58
Spartanburg 7	14,016	19,138	5,122	46
Sumter 17	6,364	11,794	3,430	65
Sumter 2	6,484	14,390	7,906	13
Union	8,266	14,016	5,750	36
Williamsburg	6,639	12,538	5,897	35
York 1	8,282	14,018	5,736	37
York 2	75,498	51,490	-24,008	85
York 3	14,714	21,170	6,456	26
York 4	16,060	23,892	7,832	14
State Total	\$13,436	\$21,513	\$8,077	
District Median			-\$5,268	

TABLE 98 (Continued)
CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL FROM 1991-92 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Assessed Valuation 1998-99	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Change	Rank
Beaufort	\$33,266	\$52,186	\$18,920	1
Charleston	16,874	34,702	17,828	2
McCormick	10,189	27,266	17,077	3
Georgetown	16,904	33,612	16,708	4
Oconee	20,151	36,639	16,488	5
Horry	24,912	38,607	13,695	6
Lexington 2	12,013	22,566	10,553	7
Greenville	15,930	26,277	10,347	8
Clarendon 1	10,230	19,851	9,621	9
Florence 1	12,744	21,467	8,723	10
Fairfield	26,307	34,906	8,599	11
Lexington 5	11,867	19,979	8,112	12
Sumter 2	6,484	14,390	7,906	13
York 4	16,060	23,892	7,832	14
Berkeley	8,302	15,964	7,662	15
Richland 1	16,663	24,289	7,626	16
Spartanburg 5	17,598	25,058	7,460	17
Colleton	10,459	17,716	7,257	18
Pickens	12,728	19,812	7,084	19
Anderson 4	16,882	23,725	6,843	20
Edgefield	8,094	14,915	6,821	21
Lexington 1	8,989	15,873	6,884	22
Lancaster	9,165	15,778	6,613	23
Dorchester 4	11,740	18,310	6,570	24
York 3	14,714	21,170	6,456	25
Aiken	11,643	18,037	6,394	26
Marlboro	5,548	11,876	6,328	27
Richland 2	11,423	17,740	6,317	28
Anderson 5	12,899	19,200	6,301	29
Lexington 3	8,031	14,303	6,272	30
Saluda	8,634	14,788	6,154	31
Chester	9,609	15,702	6,093	32
Florence 4	5,933	11,968	6,033	33
Marion 1	6,585	12,556	5,971	34
Williamsburg	6,639	12,538	5,897	35
Union	8,268	14,016	5,750	36
York 1	8,282	14,018	5,736	37
Anderson 1	10,680	16,378	5,718	38
Newberry	10,014	15,623	5,609	39
Laurens 55	9,715	15,256	5,541	40
Bamberg 2	6,577	12,066	5,489	41
Florence 3	5,737	11,083	5,346	42
Greenwood 50	11,904	17,172	5,268	43
Clarendon 2	6,061	11,322	5,261	44

TABLE 98 (Continued)
CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUATION PER PUPIL FROM 1991-92 TO 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Assessed Valuation 1998-99	Assessed Valuation 2001-02	Change	Rank
Chesterfield	\$9,526	\$14,760	\$5,234	45
Spartanburg 7	14,018	19,138	5,122	46
Allendale	9,247	14,351	5,104	47
Florence 2	7,156	12,169	5,033	48
Lee	5,427	10,349	4,922	49
Marion 2	5,009	9,901	4,892	50
Spartanburg 1	10,128	15,005	4,877	51
Dillon 2	6,371	11,162	4,791	52
Dillon 3	5,368	9,889	4,521	53
Laurens 56	10,524	14,890	4,466	54
Spartanburg 2	9,629	14,067	4,458	55
Greenwood 51	6,487	10,815	4,148	56
Kershaw	12,231	16,346	4,115	57
Spartanburg 6	17,208	21,211	4,003	58
Cherokee	12,734	16,694	3,960	59
Barnwell 29	9,519	13,478	3,959	60
Barnwell 45	7,285	11,010	3,745	61
Barnwell 19	4,745	8,353	3,608	62
Barnberg 1	5,944	9,544	3,600	63
Dillon 1	5,060	8,520	3,460	64
Sumter 17	8,364	11,794	3,430	65
Abbeville	10,473	13,860	3,387	66
Anderson 2	9,864	13,210	3,346	67
Spartanburg 4	10,635	13,630	2,995	68
Hampton 1	6,958	9,853	2,895	69
Dorchester 2	10,567	13,260	2,693	70
Darlington	14,444	16,724	2,280	71
Hampton 2	6,813	8,736	1,923	72
Clarendon 3	4,329	6,241	1,912	73
Spartanburg 3	16,861	18,402	1,541	74
Florence 5	9,368	9,716	348	75
Marion 7	8,936	9,275	339	76
Anderson 3	13,854	13,456	-498	77
Greenwood 52	18,397	16,446	-1,951	78
Lexington 4	9,397	7,316	-2,081	79
Orangeburg 4	17,845	15,687	-2,158	80
Orangeburg 3	15,520	12,530	-2,990	81
Orangeburg 5	23,737	17,580	-6,157	82
Jasper	6,227	20	-6,207	83
Calhoun	22,897	4,909	-17,988	84
York 2	75,498	51,490	-24,008	85
State Total	\$13,438	\$21,513	\$8,077	
District Median			-\$5,268	

*See "Reference for Tables"

TABLE 99
WEALTH (FISCAL CAPACITY) PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Fiscal Capacity	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Wealth Per Pupil	Rank
Abbeville	\$62,070,807	3 709	\$16 735	44
Aiken	442,131,522	23 884	18,512	36
Allendale	28,871 183	1 822	15,846	49
Anderson 1	143,678 900	7 512	19 126	34
Anderson 2	57,696 767	3 589	16 076	47
Anderson 3	40 754 725	2 572	15 846	50
Anderson 4	89 654 658	2 679	33 466	9
Anderson 5	253,279,877	11 118	22,781	19
Bamberg 1	17 024,999	1 671	10 189	78
Bamberg 2	13 400 500	1 063	12 606	68
Barnwell 19	9 423,254	979	9 625	80
Barnwell 29	13 323 712	947	14 069	62
Barnwell 45	30,272 764	2 702	11,204	75
Beaufort	1 018 974 520	18 498	61 771	1
Berkeley	465,024 666	25 980	17 899	37
Calhoun	56 826 328	1 972	28,818	12
Charleston	1 741,235 026	41 829	41,627	4
Cherokee	170 193 960	8,822	19,292	31
Chester	105 162,947	6,367	16,517	45
Chesterfield	122 652 112	7 935	15 457	53
Clarendon 1	25,348 737	1,241	20,426	28
Clarendon 2	41,374 981	3 526	11 734	72
Clarendon 3	7,691 509	1 169	6 637	85
Colleton	144 480 462	6 638	21 766	23
Darlington	218,778 395	11 415	19 166	33
Dillon 1	6,054 014	601	6 719	84
Dillon 2	43,240 474	3,688	11 725	73
Dillon 3	14 195 087	1,486	9 553	81
Dorchester 2	244,246,347	16 688	14 655	61
Dorchester 4	48,826,988	2,422	20 160	29
Edgefield	57 737,501	3,826	14 706	60
Fairfield	125,411 772	3,625	34,586	8
Florence 1	336 138 128	13 614	24 690	16
Florence 2	13,733,958	1 082	12,693	66
Florence 3	57,244 108	4 124	13,881	63
Florence 4	16,143 788	1 072	15,060	57
Florence 5	15,862,646	1 438	11,031	76
Georgetown	354,901 058	9,859	35 898	7
Greenville	1 614,366 719	59 729	27 028	14
Greenwood 50	183,287 029	8 606	20,814	27
Greenwood 51	15,716,205	1 197	13 130	65
Greenwood 52	67,581 931	1 629	41 487	5
Hampton 1	28,539 318	2 604	10,960	77
Hampton 2	13,233 378	1 443	9 171	82

TABLE 89 (Continued)
WEALTH (FISCAL CAPACITY) PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Fiscal Capacity	2000-01 ADM (K-12)	Wealth Per Pupil	Rank
Horry	\$1,208,549,798	28,455	\$42,402	3
Jasper	80,880,754	2,838	21,437	24
Kershaw	179,718,711	9,688	18,583	35
Lancaster	181,417,001	10,801	18,798	42
Laurens 55	92,708,253	5,781	16,009	48
Laurens 58	50,580,340	3,349	15,097	58
Lee	32,813,492	2,869	11,437	74
Lexington 1	289,635,538	17,288	16,773	43
Lexington 2	208,918,032	8,688	23,785	18
Lexington 3	36,658,298	2,284	16,182	48
Lexington 4	27,418,047	3,321	8,258	83
Lexington 5	328,247,440	14,755	22,111	22
McCormick	31,090,333	1,070	29,056	11
Marion 1	43,472,188	3,180	13,670	64
Marion 2	25,376,261	2,153	11,788	71
Marion 7	9,398,672	862	9,768	79
Marlboro	83,141,693	5,139	12,287	70
Newberry	98,483,074	5,751	17,121	38
Oconee	378,883,237	10,071	37,821	6
Orangeburg 3	55,617,889	3,680	15,198	55
Orangeburg 4	69,995,892	4,137	16,819	40
Orangeburg 5	140,387,259	7,288	19,238	32
Pickens	330,879,183	15,758	20,998	26
Richland 1	701,807,515	25,673	27,338	13
Richland 2	341,514,008	17,680	19,338	30
Saluda	35,227,435	2,087	16,879	41
Spartanburg 1	77,915,545	4,383	17,777	38
Spartanburg 2	127,778,949	8,080	15,814	52
Spartanburg 3	65,880,357	3,122	21,086	25
Spartanburg 4	43,477,102	2,852	15,244	54
Spartanburg 5	179,382,403	5,755	31,170	10
Spartanburg 6	220,297,855	9,102	24,193	17
Spartanburg 7	190,550,884	8,510	22,391	20
Sumter 2	114,573,823	9,170	12,494	69
Sumter 17	130,178,758	8,689	14,982	59
Union	78,581,770	4,987	15,823	51
Williamsburg	77,428,837	6,114	12,664	67
York 1	74,885,072	4,968	15,029	58
York 2	244,438,484	4,600	53,138	2
York 3	332,547,584	14,978	22,206	21
York 4	138,879,844	5,508	25,242	15
State Total	\$15,688,313,347	892,435	\$24,048	
District Median			\$18,773	

TABLE 99 (Continued)
WEALTH (FISCAL CAPACITY) PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Fiscal Capacity	2000-01 ADM (K-12)	Wealth Per Pupil	Rank
Beaufort	\$1 018 974 520	16 496	\$61 771	1
York 2	244 436 464	4 600	53 138	2
Horry	1,206 549 796	28 455	42 402	3
Charleston	1 741,235 026	41,829	41 627	4
Greenwood 52	67 581,931	1 629	41 487	5
Oconee	378 883,237	10 071	37 621	6
Georgetown	354 901 056	9,859	35 998	7
Fairfield	125 411 772	3 625	34 596	8
Anderson 4	89 654 658	2,679	33 456	9
Spartanburg 5	179 382 403	5 755	31 170	10
McCormick	31 090,333	1,070	29 056	11
Calhoun	56 828,328	1,972	28,818	12
Richland 1	701 807 515	25,673	27,336	13
Greenville	1 614 366 719	59 729	27 028	14
York 4	138,979 844	5 506	25,242	15
Florence 1	336 136 128	13 614	24 690	16
Spartanburg 6	220,207 655	9 102	24 193	17
Lexington 2	206,918 032	8 696	23 795	18
Anderson 5	253,279 877	11 118	22,781	19
Spartanburg 7	190 550 984	8,510	22,391	20
York 3	332,547 584	14,976	22,205	21
Lexington 5	326,247 440	14 755	22,111	22
Colleton	144 480 462	6 638	21 766	23
Jasper	60,860 754	2 839	21 437	24
Spartanburg 3	65,860,357	3,122	21,096	25
Pickens	330,879 193	15 758	20 998	26
Greenwood 50	183,287 029	8,806	20 814	27
Clarendon 1	25,348,737	1,241	20 426	28
Dorchester 4	48,826 888	2,422	20 160	29
Richland 2	341 514,006	17,660	19 338	30
Cherokee	170 193 960	8,822	19,282	31
Orangeburg 5	140 387,259	7,298	19,236	32
Darlington	218 776,395	11 415	19 166	33
Anderson 1	143 676,900	7,512	19 126	34
Kershaw	179 716 711	9,666	18,593	35
Aiken	442,131 522	23,684	18,512	36
Berkeley	465 024 666	25,960	17,899	37
Spartanburg 1	77,915 545	4,383	17 777	38
Newberry	66 463 074	5 751	17 121	39
Orangeburg 4	66,995 892	4 137	16,919	40
Saluda	35,227 435	2 087	16,879	41
Lancaster	181 417 001	10,801	16 796	42
Lexington 1	289,635 536	17,266	16 773	43
Abbeville	62,070 807	3 709	16 735	44

TABLE 99 (Continued)
WEALTH (FISCAL CAPACITY) PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Fiscal Capacity	2000-01 ADM (K-12)	Wealth Per Pupil	Rank
Chester	\$105,162,947	6,367	\$16,517	45
Lexington 3	36,658,298	2,284	16,192	46
Anderson 2	57,698,767	3,589	16,076	47
Laurens 55	92,706,253	5,781	16,009	48
Attendale	28,871,183	1,822	15,848	49
Anderson 3	40,754,725	2,572	15,848	50
Union	78,591,770	4,987	15,823	51
Spartanburg 2	127,778,949	8,060	15,814	52
Chesterfield	122,852,112	7,835	15,457	53
Spartanburg 4	43,477,102	2,852	15,244	54
Orangeburg 3	55,817,889	3,660	15,196	55
Laurens 58	50,560,340	3,349	15,097	56
Florence 4	16,143,786	1,072	15,060	57
York 1	74,685,072	4,968	15,029	58
Sumter 17	130,176,758	8,689	14,982	59
Edgefield	57,737,501	3,926	14,706	60
Dorchester 2	244,248,347	16,666	14,655	61
Barnwell 29	13,323,712	947	14,069	62
Florence 3	57,244,108	4,124	13,881	63
Marion 1	43,472,188	3,180	13,670	64
Greenwood 51	15,716,205	1,197	13,130	65
Florence 2	13,733,958	1,062	12,693	66
Williamsburg	77,428,937	6,114	12,684	67
Bamberg 2	13,400,500	1,063	12,606	68
Sumter 2	114,573,923	9,170	12,494	69
Marlboro	63,141,693	5,139	12,287	70
Marion 2	25,376,261	2,153	11,786	71
Clarendon 2	41,374,981	3,526	11,734	72
Dillon 2	43,240,474	3,688	11,725	73
Lee	32,813,492	2,869	11,437	74
Barnwell 45	30,272,784	2,702	11,204	75
Florence 5	15,862,648	1,438	11,031	76
Hampton 1	28,538,318	2,604	10,960	77
Bamberg 1	17,024,999	1,671	10,189	78
Marion 7	9,398,672	962	9,788	79
Barnwell 19	9,423,254	979	9,625	80
Dillon 3	14,195,087	1,488	9,553	81
Hampton 2	13,233,378	1,443	9,171	82
Lexington 4	27,418,047	3,321	8,258	83
Dillon 1	6,054,014	801	6,719	84
Clarendon 3	7,891,509	1,189	6,637	85
State Total	\$15,688,313,347	652,435	\$24,048	
District Median			\$16,773	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 100
TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Current Operations	Debt Service	Total Levy	Rank
Abbeville	147 00	28 00	175 00	31
Aiken	96 10	26 90	123 00	78
Allendale	208 00	14 00	222 00	7
Anderson 1	97 00	24 70	121 70	79
Anderson 2	134 80	60 00	194 80	17
Anderson 3	132 00	31 00	163 00	48
Anderson 4	142 50	34 70	177 20	29
Anderson 5	125 50	30 00	155 50	52
Bamberg 1	180 50	42 00	222 50	6
Bamberg 2	222 50	38 00	260 50	3
Barnwell 19	120 00	44 00	164 00	47
Barnwell 29	142 00	5 00	147 00	60
Barnwell 45	133 00	38 00	171 00	36
Beaufort	97 60	22 20	119 80	80
Berkeley	129 50	29 00	158 50	50
Calhoun	137 00	18 00	153 00	56
Charleston	81 60	21 80	103 40	83
Cherokee	160 40	6 80	167 20	38
Chester	144 90	39 30	184 20	25
Chesterfield	146 03	2 88	148 91	58
Clarendon 1	89 70	43 10	142 80	64
Clarendon 2	79 70	15 00	94 70	84
Clarendon 3	174 00	44 40	218 40	10
Colleton	115 40	11 40	126 80	75
Darlington	138 98	10 70	147 68	59
Dillon 1	124 00	10 00	134 00	68
Dillon 2	124 00	10 00	134 00	69
Dillon 3	99 50	10 00	109 50	81
Dorchester 2	152 20	29 80	182 00	28
Dorchester 4	167 10	33 40	200 50	18
Edgefield	168 45	28 00	193 45	18
Fairfield	165 60	8 80	174 40	32
Florence 1	108 20	15 10	123 30	77
Florence 2	127 40	46 90	174 30	33
Florence 3	131 50	10 50	142 00	65
Florence 4	112 20	75 30	187 50	20
Florence 5	182 70	30 50	213 20	12
Georgetown	123 20	22 40	145 60	61
Greenville	96 40	42 50	138 90	66
Greenwood 50	121 50	14 30	135 80	67
Greenwood 51	147 90	9 00	156 90	51
Greenwood 52	60 20	3 10	63 30	85
Hampton 1	187 00	16 00	203 00	13
Hampton 2	247 00	22 00	269 00	2

TABLE 100 (Continued)
TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Current Operations	Debt Service	Total Levy	Rank
Horry	102.90	22.00	124.90	76
Jasper	109.50	22.50	132.00	71
Kershaw	133.50	28.40	161.90	49
Lancaster	128.50	38.50	167.00	39
Laurens 55	142.00	24.00	166.00	40
Laurens 58	142.00	24.00	166.00	41
Lee	133.25	52.75	186.00	21
Lexington 1	228.30	24.00	250.30	4
Lexington 2	153.15	19.08	172.21	36
Lexington 3	189.40	47.00	236.40	5
Lexington 4	220.07	62.00	282.07	1
Lexington 5	172.20	49.00	221.20	8
McCormick	106.60	2.00	108.60	82
Marion 1	156.00	10.00	166.00	42
Marion 2	143.00	12.00	155.00	53
Marion 7	157.00	44.00	201.00	14
Marlboro	126.00	37.10	165.10	46
Newberry	165.00	54.50	219.50	9
Oconee	117.30	14.70	132.00	72
Orangeburg 3	148.00	27.00	173.00	34
Orangeburg 4	110.00	58.00	168.00	43
Orangeburg 5	181.00	22.00	183.00	26
Pickens	111.40	17.50	128.90	74
Richland 1	173.10	27.90	200.90	15
Richland 2	156.70	59.10	215.80	11
Saluda	130.80	40.00	170.80	37
Spartanburg 1	169.90	13.00	182.90	27
Spartanburg 2	125.70	19.70	145.40	62
Spartanburg 3	179.30	13.90	193.20	19
Spartanburg 4	143.90	10.80	154.70	56
Spartanburg 5	167.80	18.20	186.00	22
Spartanburg 6	148.20	29.20	175.40	30
Spartanburg 7	172.00	13.90	185.90	23
Sumter 2	113.60	52.30	165.90	63
Sumter 17	112.40	31.80	144.20	44
Union	157.50	7.90	165.40	45
Williamsburg	133.00	0.00	133.00	70
York 1	119.00	36.00	155.00	54
York 2	100.00	31.50	131.50	73
York 3	107.80	43.70	151.50	57
York 4	134.40	51.00	185.40	24
Average	140.28	27.37	167.65	
District Median			168.00	

TABLE 100 (Continued)
TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Current Operations	Debt Service	Total Levy	Rank
Lexington 4	220 07	62 00	282 07	1
Hampton 2	247 00	22 00	269 00	2
Bamberg 2	222.50	38 00	260 50	3
Lexington 1	226 30	24 00	250 30	4
Lexington 3	189 40	47 00	236 40	5
Bamberg 1	180 50	42 00	222 50	6
Allendale	208 00	14.00	222 00	7
Lexington 5	172.20	49 00	221.20	8
Newberry	185 00	54 50	219 50	9
Clarendon 3	174 00	44 40	218 40	10
Richland 2	156 70	59 10	215 80	11
Florence 5	182 70	30 50	213.20	12
Hampton 1	187 00	16 00	203 00	13
Marion 7	157 00	44 00	201 00	14
Richland 1	173 10	27 80	200 90	15
Dorchester 4	167 10	33 40	200 50	16
Anderson 2	134 80	60 00	194 80	17
Edgefield	165 45	28 00	193 45	18
Spartanburg 3	179 30	13 90	193.20	19
Florence 4	112.20	75 30	187 50	20
Lee	133.25	52 75	186 00	21
Spartanburg 5	167 80	18.20	186 00	22
Spartanburg 7	172.00	13 90	185 90	23
York 4	134 40	51 00	185 40	24
Chester	144 80	39 30	184.20	25
Orangeburg 5	161 00	22 00	183 00	26
Spartanburg 1	169 90	13 00	182 90	27
Dorchester 2	152.20	29 80	182 00	28
Anderson 4	142.50	34 70	177 20	29
Spartanburg 6	148.20	29.20	175 40	30
Abbeville	147 00	28.00	175 00	31
Fairfield	165 60	8.80	174 40	32
Florence 2	127 40	48.90	174 30	33
Orangeburg 3	148.00	27 00	173 00	34
Lexington 2	153 15	19 06	172.21	35
Barnwell 45	133 00	38 00	171 00	36
Saluda	130.80	40 00	170.80	37
Cherokee	160 40	6.80	167.20	38
Lancaster	128.50	38 50	167 00	39
Laurens 55	142 00	24 00	166 00	40
Laurens 56	142 00	24 00	166 00	41
Marion 1	156 00	10 00	166 00	42
Orangeburg 4	110 00	56 00	166 00	43
Sumter 2	113 60	52.30	165 90	44

**TABLE 100 (Continued)
TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Ranked Numerically				
District	Current Operations	Debt Service	Total Levy	Rank
Union	157.50	7.90	165.40	45
Marlboro	128.00	37.10	165.10	46
Barnwell 19	120.00	44.00	164.00	47
Anderson 3	132.00	31.00	163.00	48
Kershaw	133.50	28.40	161.90	49
Berkeley	129.50	29.00	158.50	50
Greenwood 51	147.90	9.00	156.90	51
Anderson 5	125.50	30.00	155.50	52
Marion 2	143.00	12.00	155.00	53
York 1	119.00	36.00	155.00	54
Spartanburg 4	143.80	10.80	154.70	55
Calhoun	137.00	16.00	153.00	56
York 3	107.80	43.70	151.50	57
Chesterfield	146.03	2.88	148.91	58
Dartington	136.96	10.70	147.66	59
Barnwell 28	142.00	5.00	147.00	60
Georgetown	123.20	22.40	145.60	61
Spartanburg 2	125.70	19.70	145.40	62
Sumter 17	112.40	31.80	144.20	63
Clarendon 1	99.70	43.10	142.80	64
Florence 3	131.50	10.50	142.00	65
Greenville	96.40	42.50	138.90	66
Greenwood 50	121.50	14.30	135.80	67
Dillon 1	124.00	10.00	134.00	68
Dillon 2	124.00	10.00	134.00	69
Williamsburg	133.00	0.00	133.00	70
Jasper	109.50	22.50	132.00	71
Oconee	117.30	14.70	132.00	72
York 2	100.00	31.50	131.50	73
Pickens	111.40	17.50	128.90	74
Colleton	115.40	11.40	126.80	75
Horry	102.80	22.00	124.80	76
Florence 1	108.20	15.10	123.30	77
Aiken	96.10	26.90	123.00	78
Anderson 1	97.00	24.70	121.70	79
Beaufort	97.60	22.20	119.80	80
Dillon 3	99.50	10.00	109.50	81
McCormick	108.60	2.00	108.60	82
Charleston	81.60	21.80	103.40	83
Clarendon 2	79.70	15.00	94.70	84
Greenwood 52	60.20	3.10	63.30	85
Average	140.28	27.37	167.65	
District Median			166.00	

*See "References for Tables"

**TABLE 101
CHANGE IN THE TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically				
District	1998-99 Levy	2001-02 Levy	Change	Rank
Abbeville	139.70	175.00	35.30	9
Aiken	122.80	123.00	0.20	66
Allendale	192.00	222.00	30.00	14
Anderson 1	98.75	121.70	24.95	22
Anderson 2	117.00	194.80	77.80	1
Anderson 3	133.40	163.00	29.60	15
Anderson 4	173.30	177.20	3.90	55
Anderson 5	165.00	155.50	9.50	79
Bamberg 1	200.00	222.50	22.50	24
Bamberg 2	241.00	260.50	19.50	32
Barnwell 19	105.00	184.00	59.00	2
Barnwell 29	131.00	147.00	16.00	36
Barnwell 45	148.00	171.00	25.00	20
Beaufort	99.50	119.80	20.30	29
Berkeley	160.00	158.50	1.50	70
Calhoun	137.00	183.00	16.00	37
Charleston	105.60	103.40	2.20	72
Cherokee	151.70	167.20	15.50	38
Chester	183.00	184.20	1.20	64
Chesterfield	145.80	148.91	3.11	56
Clarendon 1	143.70	142.80	-0.90	69
Clarendon 2	102.40	94.70	7.70	78
Clarendon 3	196.70	218.40	21.70	26
Colleton	127.00	126.80	-0.20	67
Darlington	138.80	147.66	7.86	49
Dillon 1	90.00	134.00	44.00	4
Dillon 2	106.00	134.00	29.00	16
Dillon 3	90.00	109.50	19.50	33
Dorchester 2	179.40	182.00	2.60	59
Dorchester 4	157.30	200.50	43.20	5
Edgefield	187.70	193.45	5.75	61
Fairfield	174.70	174.40	-0.30	68
Florence 1	109.90	123.30	13.40	41
Florence 2	190.80	174.30	16.50	81
Florence 3	131.80	142.00	10.20	44
Florence 4	190.80	187.50	-3.10	73
Florence 5	191.80	213.20	21.40	27
Georgetown	169.50	145.60	23.90	84
Greenville	134.60	138.90	4.30	53
Greenwood 50	133.50	135.80	2.30	60
Greenwood 51	116.30	156.90	40.60	7
Greenwood 52	34.70	83.30	28.60	17
Hampton 1	222.00	203.00	19.00	82
Hampton 2	255.00	269.00	14.00	40

TABLE 101 (Continued)
CHANGE IN THE TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	1998-99 Levy	2001-02 Levy	Change	Rank
Horry	128.30	124.90	-3.40	74
Jasper	129.91	132.00	2.09	61
Kershaw	155.40	161.90	6.50	50
Lancaster	166.50	167.00	0.50	65
Laurens 55	144.00	166.00	22.00	25
Laurens 56	140.00	166.00	26.00	19
Lee	161.00	166.00	25.00	21
Lexington 1	214.60	250.30	35.70	8
Lexington 2	191.90	172.21	-19.69	83
Lexington 3	205.80	236.40	30.60	12
Lexington 4	234.80	282.07	47.27	3
Lexington 5	209.00	221.20	12.20	42
McCormick	112.00	106.60	-3.40	75
Marion 1	146.00	166.00	20.00	31
Marion 2	131.00	155.00	24.00	23
Marion 7	159.00	201.00	42.00	6
Marlboro	145.00	165.10	20.10	30
Newberry	230.00	219.50	-10.50	80
Oconee	130.70	132.00	1.30	63
Orangeburg 3	169.00	173.00	4.00	54
Orangeburg 4	138.00	166.00	28.00	18
Orangeburg 5	181.00	183.00	2.00	62
Pickens	119.80	128.90	9.00	46
Richland 1	183.80	200.90	17.00	35
Richland 2	206.80	215.80	9.00	47
Selma	162.70	170.80	8.10	48
Spartanburg 1	163.60	182.90	19.30	34
Spartanburg 2	130.30	145.40	15.10	39
Spartanburg 3	182.90	193.20	10.30	43
Spartanburg 4	133.60	154.70	21.20	28
Spartanburg 5	152.60	186.00	33.40	11
Spartanburg 6	141.80	175.40	33.60	10
Spartanburg 7	192.50	185.90	-6.60	77
Sumter 17	148.90	144.20	-4.70	76
Sumter 2	167.40	165.90	-1.50	71
Union	161.00	165.40	4.40	52
Williamsburg	130.00	133.00	3.00	57
York 1	181.00	155.00	-26.00	85
York 2	122.00	131.50	9.50	45
York 3	148.70	161.50	2.80	58
York 4	155.00	185.40	30.40	13
Average	154.43	167.65	13.21	
District Median			10.30	

TABLE 101 (Continued)
CHANGE IN THE TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	1998-99 Levy	2001-02 Levy	Change	Rank
Anderson 2	117.00	194.80	77.80	1
Barnwell 19	105.00	164.00	59.00	2
Lexington 4	234.80	282.07	47.27	3
Dillon 1	90.00	134.00	44.00	4
Dorchester 4	157.30	200.50	43.20	5
Marion 7	158.00	201.00	42.00	6
Greenwood 51	118.30	158.90	40.60	7
Lexington 1	214.60	250.30	35.70	8
Abbeville	139.70	175.00	35.30	9
Spartanburg 6	141.60	175.40	33.80	10
Spartanburg 5	152.60	188.00	33.40	11
Lexington 3	205.80	238.40	30.60	12
York 4	155.00	185.40	30.40	13
Allendale	192.00	222.00	30.00	14
Anderson 3	133.40	163.00	29.60	15
Dillon 2	105.00	134.00	29.00	16
Greenwood 52	34.70	63.30	28.60	17
Orangeburg 4	138.00	166.00	28.00	18
Laurens 56	140.00	168.00	28.00	19
Barnwell 45	146.00	171.00	25.00	20
Lee	161.00	186.00	25.00	21
Anderson 1	96.75	121.70	24.95	22
Marion 2	131.00	155.00	24.00	23
Bamberg 1	200.00	222.60	22.60	24
Laurens 55	144.00	166.00	22.00	25
Clarendon 3	196.70	218.40	21.70	26
Florence 5	191.80	213.20	21.40	27
Spartanburg 4	133.50	154.70	21.20	28
Beaufort	99.50	119.80	20.30	29
Marlboro	145.00	165.10	20.10	30
Marion 1	148.00	168.00	20.00	31
Bamberg 2	241.00	260.50	19.50	32
Dillon 3	90.00	109.50	19.50	33
Spartanburg 1	183.60	182.90	19.30	34
Richland 1	183.90	200.80	17.00	35
Barnwell 29	131.00	147.00	16.00	36
Calhoun	137.00	153.00	16.00	37
Cherokee	151.70	167.20	15.50	38
Spartanburg 2	130.30	145.40	15.10	39
Hampton 2	255.00	269.00	14.00	40
Florence 1	109.80	123.30	13.40	41
Lexington 5	208.00	221.20	12.20	42
Spartanburg 3	182.90	193.20	10.30	43
Florence 3	131.80	142.00	10.20	44

TABLE 101 (Continued)
CHANGE IN THE TOTAL TAX LEVY IN MILLS FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	1998-99 Levy	2001-02 Levy	Change	Rank
York 2	122.00	131.50	9.50	45
Pickens	119.90	128.90	9.00	46
Richland 2	206.80	215.80	9.00	47
Saluda	162.70	170.80	8.10	48
Darlington	139.80	147.68	7.88	49
Kershaw	155.40	161.90	6.50	50
Edgefield	187.70	193.45	5.75	51
Union	161.00	165.40	4.40	52
Greenville	134.60	138.90	4.30	53
Orangeburg 3	169.00	173.00	4.00	54
Anderson 4	173.30	177.20	3.90	55
Chesterfield	145.80	148.91	3.11	56
Williamsburg	130.00	133.00	3.00	57
York 3	148.70	151.50	2.80	58
Dorchester 2	179.40	182.00	2.60	59
Greenwood 50	133.50	135.80	2.30	60
Jasper	129.91	132.00	2.09	61
Orangeburg 5	181.00	183.00	2.00	62
Oconee	130.70	132.00	1.30	63
Chester	183.00	184.20	1.20	64
Lancaster	166.50	167.00	0.50	65
Alcon	122.80	123.00	0.20	66
Colleton	127.00	126.80	-0.20	67
Fairfield	174.70	174.40	-0.30	68
Clarendon 1	143.70	142.80	-0.90	69
Berkeley	160.00	158.50	-1.50	70
Sumter 2	167.40	165.90	-1.50	71
Charleston	105.60	103.40	-2.20	72
Florence 4	190.60	187.50	-3.10	73
Horry	128.30	124.90	-3.40	74
McCormick	112.00	108.60	-3.40	75
Sumter 17	148.90	144.20	-4.70	76
Spartanburg 7	192.50	185.90	-6.60	77
Clarendon 2	102.40	94.70	-7.70	78
Anderson 5	165.00	155.50	-9.50	79
Newberry	230.00	219.50	-10.50	80
Florence 2	190.80	174.30	-16.50	81
Hampton 1	222.00	203.00	-19.00	82
Lexington 2	191.90	172.21	-19.69	83
Georgetown	169.50	145.60	-23.90	84
York 1	181.00	155.00	-26.00	85
Average	154.43	167.65	13.21	
District Median			10.30	

*See "References for Tables."

TABLE 102
LOCAL TAX EFFORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Ability Index	Tax Revenue Current Operations	Equalized Revenue	Tax Effort	Rank
Abbeville	0 003956	\$6 742 350	\$5 921 015	1 139	41
Alben	0 028182	36 647 540	42 180 494	0 869	73
Allendale	0 001840	4 483 637	2,753 960	1 628	7
Anderson 1	0 009158	13 192,381	13 706,839	0 862	65
Anderson 2	0 003678	7 022,351	5 504 927	1,276	26
Anderson 3	0 002598	4 193,038	3 888 472	1 078	50
Anderson 4	0 005715	8 338,689	8 553,741	0 975	63
Anderson 5	0 016144	25 143 634	24 163 008	1 041	54
Bamberg 1	0 001085	2 268 700	1 623,939	1 397	20
Bamberg 2	0 000854	2,268,276	1,278 197	1 773	3
Barnwell 19	0 000601	1 415 663	899 527	1 574	10
Barnwell 29	0 000849	1 525,805	1,270 713	1,201	34
Barnwell 45	0 001930	3 575 038	2,888 665	1,238	31
Beaufort	0 064951	74 672 812	97,213,302	0 768	82
Berkeley	0 029641	39 387 027	44 364,205	0 888	72
Calhoun	0 003622	5 771,221	5 421 111	1 065	52
Charleston	0 110989	107 434 892	166 119 185	0 647	84
Cherokee	0 010848	20 895 010	16,236 392	1 287	25
Chester	0 006703	11 065 755	10,032 498	1 103	46
Chesterfield	0 007818	13 730 630	11 701 338	1 173	38
Clarendon 1	0 001616	1 879,358	2,418 686	0 777	81
Clarendon 2	0 002637	2 562,919	3,846,844	0 649	83
Clarendon 3	0 000503	955 400	752 849	1,269	27
Colleton	0 008209	11 082,592	13,783,272	0 805	79
Darlington	0 013945	25 304 638	20,871 726	1,212	33
Dillon 1	0 000386	845 588	577 733	1 464	15
Dillon 2	0 002756	4 100 441	4 124 954	0 994	59
Dillon 3	0 000905	1 397 811	1,354 529	1 032	58
Dorchester 2	0 003112	25 653 767	4 657 785	5 508	1
Dorchester 4	0 015569	7,264 048	23,302 386	0 312	85
Edgefield	0 003680	7 155 694	5,507,821	1,289	23
Fairfield	0 007994	18,265 575	11,964 760	1,527	11
Florence 1	0 021426	27 531 035	32,068,670	0 859	75
Florence 2	0 000875	1,298 898	1,308 628	0 992	60
Florence 3	0 003649	5,214,282	5,481,522	0 955	66
Florence 4	0 001029	1,282,324	1 540 122	0 833	78
Florence 5	0 001011	2,217,323	1 513 181	1 465	14
Georgetown	0 022622	33 487 102	33 858 745	0 989	62
Greenville	0 102903	121 064 035	154 016 727	0 786	80
Greenwood 50	0 011683	18 692,664	17 486,151	1 063	53
Greenwood 51	0 001002	2,262 411	1 499 711	1 509	12
Greenwood 52	0 004308	5 881,243	6 447,859	0 912	69
Hampton 1	0 001819	4 040 167	2,722 529	1 484	13
Hampton 2	0 000844	2,541,293	1,263,230	2 012	2

TABLE 102 (Continued)
LOCAL TAX EFFORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically					
District	Ability Index	Tax Revenue Current Operations	Equalized Revenue	Tax Effort	Rank
Horry	0 076908	\$97,401,342	\$115,109,554	0.848	76
Jasper	0 003879	5,211,794	5,805,787	0.898	71
Kershaw	0 011455	16,983,108	17,144,900	0.991	61
Lancaster	0 011584	16,056,230	17,308,042	0.928	68
Laurens 55	0 005909	10,363,445	8,844,104	1.172	39
Laurens 56	0 003223	5,683,388	4,823,921	1.178	37
Lee	0 002092	3,691,241	3,131,133	1.179	38
Lexington 1	0.018462	44,721,152	27,632,400	1.618	8
Lexington 2	0 013189	22,114,081	19,740,208	1.120	43
Lexington 3	0 002273	4,782,808	3,402,039	1.408	19
Lexington 4	0 001748	4,227,743	2,616,262	1.616	9
Lexington 5	0 020796	38,122,380	31,125,738	1.225	32
McCormick	0 001982	2,800,260	2,968,494	0.944	67
Manon 1	0 002771	3,570,089	4,147,404	0.861	74
Marion 2	0 001818	2,508,197	2,421,689	1.038	55
Marion 7	0 000599	1,468,628	896,534	1.638	6
Marlboro	0 004025	6,468,147	6,024,288	1.074	51
Newberry	0 006276	11,744,936	9,393,399	1.250	29
Oconee	0 024151	37,091,235	38,147,228	1.026	58
Orangeburg 3	0 003545	7,025,590	5,305,884	1.324	22
Orangeburg 4	0 004462	7,364,601	6,678,354	1.103	47
Orangeburg 5	0.008948	18,460,630	13,394,125	1.378	21
Pickers	0.021091	26,304,042	31,587,270	0.833	77
Richland 1	0 044734	96,361,840	68,954,163	1.439	16
Richland 2	0 021769	40,581,182	32,582,044	1.246	30
Saluda	0 002245	3,655,487	3,360,131	1.088	48
Spartanburg 1	0 004966	10,490,728	7,432,699	1.411	18
Spartanburg 2	0 008145	14,121,035	12,190,764	1.158	40
Spartanburg 3	0 004198	10,429,418	6,283,220	1.660	5
Spartanburg 4	0 002771	5,234,947	4,147,404	1.262	28
Spartanburg 5	0 011434	22,068,236	17,113,469	1.289	24
Spartanburg 6	0 014036	23,360,762	21,007,928	1.112	44
Spartanburg 7	0.012146	30,671,662	18,179,131	1.587	4
Sumter 2	0 007303	10,526,519	10,930,528	0.963	64
Sumter 17	0 008298	11,235,587	12,419,762	0.905	70
Union	0 005010	8,974,048	7,498,555	1.197	35
Williamsburg	0 004935	7,620,837	7,386,301	1.032	57
York 1	0.004759	10,185,016	7,122,679	1.430	17
York 2	0.015581	26,319,156	23,320,356	1.129	42
York 3	0 021197	34,371,359	31,725,922	1.083	49
York 4	0 008859	14,683,617	13,269,421	1.107	45
State Total	1.000000	\$1,496,717,555	\$1,496,717,555	1.000	
District Median				1.120	

TABLE 102 (Continued)
LOCAL TAX EFFORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Ability Index	Tax Revenue Current Operations	Equalized Revenue	Tax Effort	Rank
Dorchester 2	0 003112	\$25 653 767	\$4 657 785	5 508	1
Hampton 2	0 000844	2 541,293	1,263,230	2 012	2
Bamberg 2	0 000854	2,266,276	1,278 197	1 773	3
Spartanburg 7	0 012148	30 671 862	18 179 131	1 687	4
Spartanburg 3	0 004198	10 429 418	6,283,220	1 660	5
Marion 7	0 000599	1 488 828	898 534	1 838	6
Allendale	0 001840	4 483 637	2 753 960	1 628	7
Lexington 1	0 018482	44 721 152	27 632 400	1 618	8
Lexington 4	0 001748	4,227 743	2 616,262	1 616	9
Barnwell 19	0 000601	1 415 663	899 527	1 574	10
Fairfield	0 007994	18,265 575	11 984 760	1,527	11
Greenwood 51	0 001002	2,262 411	1 499 711	1 509	12
Hampton 1	0 001819	4 040 187	2 722 528	1 484	13
Florence 5	0 001011	2,217 323	1 513 181	1 465	14
Dillon 1	0 000388	845 588	577 733	1 464	15
Richland 1	0 044734	98 381 840	68 954 163	1 439	16
York 1	0 004759	10 185 016	7 122 879	1 430	17
Spartanburg 1	0 004966	10 480 728	7 432 699	1 411	18
Lexington 3	0 002273	4 782 608	3 402 039	1 408	19
Bamberg 1	0 001085	2,268 700	1 623 939	1,387	20
Orangeburg 5	0 008949	18 460 630	13 394 125	1 378	21
Orangeburg 3	0 003545	7 025 590	5 305 864	1 324	22
Edgefield	0 003680	7 155 694	5 507 821	1,289	23
Spartanburg 5	0 011434	22 066,238	17 113 489	1,289	24
Cherokee	0 010848	20,895 010	16,238 392	1,287	25
Anderson 2	0 003678	7 022 351	5 504 927	1,276	26
Clarendon 3	0 000503	956 400	752 849	1,269	27
Spartanburg 4	0 002771	5,234 947	4 147 404	1,262	28
Newberry	0 006278	11 744,936	9,393 399	1,250	29
Richland 2	0 021769	40 581 192	32,582 044	1,246	30
Barnwell 45	0 001930	3 575 038	2,888 685	1,238	31
Lexington 5	0 020786	38 122,380	31 125 738	1,225	32
Darlington	0 013945	25,304 636	20 871 728	1,212	33
Barnwell 29	0 000849	1 525 805	1,270 713	1,201	34
Union	0 005010	8 974 048	7 498 555	1 197	35
Lee	0 002092	3 691,241	3 131 133	1 179	36
Laurens 56	0 003223	5,883,388	4,823 921	1 178	37
Chesterfield	0 007818	13 730 630	11 701 338	1 173	38
Laurens 55	0 005909	10,363 445	8,844 104	1 172	39
Spartanburg 2	0 008145	14 121 035	12 190 764	1 158	40
Abbeville	0 003956	6 742,350	5,921 015	1 139	41
York 2	0 015581	26 319 156	23 320 356	1 129	42
Lexington 2	0 013189	22 114 081	19 740 208	1 120	43
Spartanburg 6	0 014036	23 360 782	21 007 828	1 112	44

TABLE 102 (Continued)
LOCAL TAX EFFORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	Ability Index	Tax Revenue Current Operations	Equalized Revenue	Tax Effort	Rank
York 4	0.008859	\$14,683,617	\$13,259,421	1.107	45
Chester	0.008703	11,065,755	10,032,498	1.103	46
Orangeburg 4	0.004462	7,364,601	6,678,354	1.103	47
Saluda	0.002245	3,655,487	3,360,131	1.088	48
York 3	0.021187	34,371,359	31,725,922	1.083	49
Anderson 3	0.002598	4,193,038	3,888,472	1.078	50
Marlboro	0.004026	8,468,147	6,024,288	1.074	51
Calhoun	0.003622	5,771,221	5,421,111	1.065	52
Greenwood 50	0.011683	18,592,664	17,488,151	1.063	53
Anderson 5	0.016144	25,143,634	24,163,008	1.041	54
Marion 2	0.001618	2,608,197	2,421,689	1.036	55
Dillon 3	0.000905	1,397,811	1,354,629	1.032	56
Williamsburg	0.004935	7,620,837	7,386,301	1.032	57
Oconee	0.024151	37,091,235	36,147,226	1.026	58
Dillon 2	0.002758	4,100,441	4,124,954	0.994	59
Florence 2	0.000675	1,298,868	1,309,628	0.992	60
Kershaw	0.011455	16,983,106	17,144,800	0.991	61
Georgetown	0.022622	33,487,102	33,858,745	0.989	62
Anderson 4	0.005715	8,338,689	8,553,741	0.975	63
Sumter 2	0.007303	10,528,519	10,930,528	0.963	64
Anderson 1	0.009158	13,192,381	13,706,839	0.962	65
Florence 3	0.003649	5,214,282	5,481,522	0.955	66
McCormick	0.001982	2,800,260	2,968,494	0.944	67
Lancaster	0.011564	16,058,230	17,308,042	0.928	68
Greenwood 52	0.004308	5,881,243	6,447,859	0.912	69
Sumter 17	0.006298	11,235,567	12,418,762	0.905	70
Jasper	0.003879	5,211,794	5,805,767	0.898	71
Berkeley	0.029641	39,387,027	44,364,205	0.888	72
Alken	0.026182	36,847,540	42,180,494	0.869	73
Marion 1	0.002771	3,570,089	4,147,404	0.861	74
Florence 1	0.021426	27,531,935	32,068,870	0.859	75
Horry	0.078908	97,401,342	115,109,554	0.848	76
Pickens	0.021091	28,304,042	31,567,270	0.833	77
Florence 4	0.001029	1,282,324	1,540,122	0.833	78
Colleton	0.009209	11,082,582	13,783,272	0.805	79
Greenville	0.102903	121,084,035	154,016,727	0.786	80
Clarendon 1	0.001616	1,879,359	2,418,696	0.777	81
Beaufort	0.064951	74,672,812	97,213,302	0.768	82
Clarendon 2	0.002637	2,582,919	3,946,844	0.649	83
Charleston	0.110989	107,434,892	186,119,185	0.647	84
Dorchester 4	0.015568	7,264,048	23,302,398	0.312	85
State Total	1.000000	\$1,498,717,555	\$1,498,717,555	1.000	
District Median				1.120	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 103
 FUNDING INDEX FOR THE EDUCATION FINANCE ACT 2001-02*
 BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically					
District	2001-02 Funding Index	Rank	District	2001-02 Funding Index	Rank
Abbeville	0 004230	48	Horry	0 077190	3
Aiken	0 029800	6	Jasper	0 003760	54
Allendale	0 001930	69	Kershaw	0 011720	26
Anderson 1	0 009490	28	Lancaster	0 011280	27
Anderson 2	0 003920	53	Laurens 55	0 006410	39
Anderson 3	0 002850	61	Laurens 56	0 003640	55
Anderson 4	0 005650	40	Lee	0 002180	66
Anderson 5	0 017220	17	Lexington 1	0 017560	16
Bamberg 1	0 001150	74	Lexington 2	0 013810	21
Bamberg 2	0 000930	80	Lexington 3	0 002430	63
Bamwell 19	0 000640	83	Lexington 4	0 001820	70
Bamwell 29	0 000950	78	Lexington 5	0 019800	14
Bamwell 45	0 002310	65	McCormick	0 002000	68
Beaufort	0 057910	4	Marion 1	0 002880	60
Berkeley	0 027740	7	Marion 2	0 001770	71
Calhoun	0 004100	50	Marion 7	0 000680	82
Charleston	0 096390	2	Marlboro	0 004170	49
Cherokee	0 011750	25	Newberry	0 006810	38
Chester	0.006850	37	Oconee	0 025080	8
Chesterfield	0 008260	33	Orangeburg 3	0 003410	57
Clarendon 1	0 001560	72	Orangeburg 4	0 004860	45
Clarendon 2	0 002650	62	Orangeburg 5	0 009250	29
Clarendon 3	0 000520	84	Pickens	0 021430	10
Colleton	0 008760	31	Richland 1	0 045700	5
Darlington	0 015150	19	Richland 2	0 020740	12
Dillon 1	0 000520	85	Saluda	0 002350	64
Dillon 2	0 002980	59	Spartanburg 1	0 005150	44
Dillon 3	0 001010	77	Spartanburg 2	0 008220	34
Dorchester 2	0 015250	18	Spartanburg 3	0 005510	42
Dorchester 4	0 003420	58	Spartanburg 4	0 003050	58
Edgefield	0 004080	51	Spartanburg 5	0 011990	24
Fairfield	0 008940	30	Spartanburg 6	0 015060	20
Florence 1	0 022970	9	Spartanburg 7	0 012980	23
Florence 2	0 000930	81	Sumter 2	0.008500	32
Florence 3	0 003940	52	Sumter 17	0 007160	38
Florence 4	0 001040	75	Union	0 005180	43
Florence 5	0 001170	73	Williamsburg	0 005600	41
Georgetown	0 020290	13	York 1	0 004850	46
Greenville	0 105930	1	York 2	0 017960	15
Greenwood 50	0 013010	22	York 3	0 021100	11
Greenwood 51	0 000940	79	York 4	0 008160	35
Greenwood 52	0 004470	47	State Total	1 000000	
Hampton 1	0 002120	67	District Median	0.005180	
Hampton 2	0 001020	76			

TABLE 103 (Continued)
FUNDING INDEX FOR THE EDUCATION FINANCE ACT 2001-02*
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically					
District	2001-02 Funding Index	Rank	District	2001-02 Funding Index	Rank
Greenville	0 105830	1	Orangeburg 4	0 004860	45
Charleston	0 096390	2	York 1	0.004850	46
Horry	0 077190	3	Greenwood 52	0 004470	47
Beaufort	0 057910	4	Abbeville	0 004230	48
Richland 1	0.045700	5	Marlboro	0 004170	49
Alben	0 029800	6	Calhoun	0 004100	50
Berkley	0 027740	7	Edgefield	0 004080	51
Oconee	0.025080	8	Florence 3	0 003940	52
Florence 1	0.022970	9	Anderson 2	0.003920	53
Pickens	0 021430	10	Jasper	0.003760	54
York 3	0.021100	11	Laurens 58	0.003640	55
Richland 2	0.020740	12	Dorchester 4	0.003420	56
Georgetown	0.020290	13	Orangeburg 3	0.003410	57
Lexington 5	0.019800	14	Spartanburg 4	0.003050	58
York 2	0.017980	15	Dillon 2	0 002980	59
Lexington 1	0 017580	16	Marion 1	0 002880	60
Anderson 5	0 017220	17	Anderson 3	0 002650	61
Dorchester 2	0.015250	18	Clarendon 2	0 002650	62
Darlington	0 015150	19	Lexington 3	0 002430	63
Spartanburg 6	0 015080	20	Saluda	0.002350	64
Lexington 2	0 013810	21	Barnwell 45	0 002310	65
Greenwood 50	0 013010	22	Lee	0.002160	66
Spartanburg 7	0 012980	23	Hampton 1	0 002120	67
Spartanburg 5	0 011990	24	McCormick	0 002000	68
Cherokee	0 011750	25	Allendale	0 001930	69
Kershaw	0 011720	26	Lexington 4	0 001820	70
Lancaster	0 011280	27	Marion 2	0 001770	71
Anderson 1	0 009490	28	Clarendon 1	0 001580	72
Orangeburg 5	0 008250	29	Florence 5	0.001170	73
Fairfield	0.008940	30	Bamberg 1	0.001150	74
Colleton	0 008760	31	Florence 4	0.001040	75
Sumter 2	0.008500	32	Hampton 2	0 001020	76
Chesterfield	0.008280	33	Dillon 3	0 001010	77
Spartanburg 2	0 008220	34	Barnwell 29	0 000950	78
York 4	0.008180	35	Greenwood 51	0.000940	79
Sumter 17	0.007180	36	Bamberg 2	0.000930	80
Chester	0.006950	37	Florence 2	0.000930	81
Newberry	0.006810	38	Marion 7	0.000880	82
Laurens 55	0 006410	39	Barnwell 19	0.000640	83
Anderson 4	0.005850	40	Clarendon 3	0.000520	84
Williamsburg	0 005600	41	Dillon 1	0.000520	85
Spartanburg 3	0 005510	42	State Total	1.000000	
Union	0 005180	43	District Median	0.005180	
Spartanburg 1	0 005150	44			

See "Reference for Tables"

TABLE 104
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE)*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Total Current Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$27,128,258	3,709	\$7,314	48
Aiken	152,772,293	23,884	6,396	79
Allendale	18,885,772	1,822	10,365	2
Anderson 1	48,937,598	7,512	6,248	84
Anderson 2	24,229,504	3,589	6,751	72
Anderson 3	16,172,986	2,572	6,288	83
Anderson 4	19,728,864	2,679	7,364	45
Anderson 5	82,460,533	11,118	7,417	42
Bamberg 1	12,755,419	1,671	7,633	30
Bamberg 2	11,048,811	1,063	10,392	1
Barnwell 19	8,384,894	979	8,544	18
Barnwell 29	7,374,279	947	7,787	27
Barnwell 45	18,539,865	2,702	6,882	66
Beaufort	133,950,056	16,498	8,120	22
Berkeley	176,887,726	25,980	6,809	69
Calhoun	17,582,997	1,972	8,906	9
Charleston	308,491,344	41,829	7,375	44
Cherokee	62,399,223	8,822	7,073	51
Chester	46,785,088	6,367	7,348	47
Chesterfield	55,448,150	7,935	6,988	58
Clarendon 1	10,636,776	1,241	8,571	17
Clarendon 2	22,314,033	3,528	6,328	81
Clarendon 3	8,345,361	1,189	7,019	55
Colleton	48,774,517	6,638	7,048	53
Darlington	82,741,343	11,415	7,248	49
Dillon 1	6,204,820	901	6,887	62
Dillon 2	23,871,708	3,688	6,473	77
Dillon 3	9,653,434	1,488	6,486	76
Dorchester 2	104,051,458	16,668	6,243	85
Dorchester 4	20,826,709	2,422	8,589	15
Edgefield	30,270,144	3,828	7,710	29
Fairfield	34,391,600	3,625	9,487	5
Florence 1	95,504,453	13,614	7,015	56
Florence 2	8,053,582	1,082	7,443	38
Florence 3	30,317,447	4,124	7,361	46
Florence 4	10,501,921	1,072	9,797	3
Florence 5	10,701,872	1,438	7,442	39
Georgetown	84,565,465	9,859	8,577	16
Greenville	380,013,119	59,729	6,362	80
Greenwood 50	60,527,983	8,806	6,873	64
Greenwood 51	9,312,192	1,197	7,780	28
Greenwood 52	10,919,789	1,629	6,703	73
Hampton 1	19,817,752	2,604	7,811	31
Hampton 2	12,483,201	1,443	8,651	14

TABLE 104 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE)*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Total Current Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$213,685,216	28,455	\$7,510	35
Jasper	22,187,384	2,639	7,819	26
Kershaw	64,384,932	9,886	6,661	74
Lancaster	74,139,321	10,801	6,864	65
Laurens 55	40,736,154	5,781	7,034	54
Laurens 56	23,656,293	3,348	7,064	52
Lee	25,546,899	2,889	8,904	10
Lexington 1	124,503,851	17,288	7,210	50
Lexington 2	88,934,101	8,698	7,927	24
Lexington 3	18,480,469	2,284	8,183	21
Lexington 4	23,040,213	3,321	6,838	61
Lexington 5	111,094,208	14,755	7,529	34
McCormick	10,066,852	1,070	9,408	6
Marion 1	21,873,705	3,180	6,879	63
Marion 2	16,251,958	2,153	7,549	33
Marion 7	9,338,837	962	9,708	4
Marlboro	34,870,476	5,139	6,785	70
Newberry	45,085,159	5,751	7,840	25
Oconee	81,517,100	10,071	8,094	23
Orangeburg 3	30,868,888	3,660	8,434	19
Orangeburg 4	31,387,047	4,137	7,587	32
Orangeburg 5	64,597,016	7,298	8,851	13
Pickens	103,063,045	15,768	6,540	75
Richland 1	231,524,424	25,873	9,018	8
Richland 2	130,772,695	17,660	7,405	43
Saluda	17,147,853	2,087	8,217	20
Spartanburg 1	32,862,772	4,383	7,498	38
Spartanburg 2	48,091,511	8,080	5,952	86
Spartanburg 3	27,740,058	3,122	8,885	12
Spartanburg 4	18,350,488	2,852	6,434	78
Spartanburg 5	42,897,397	5,755	7,419	41
Spartanburg 6	57,285,486	9,102	6,282	82
Spartanburg 7	76,881,290	8,510	9,032	7
Sumter 2	62,477,058	9,170	6,813	68
Sumter 17	60,683,082	8,689	6,984	59
Union	36,927,872	4,967	7,435	40
Williamsburg	45,600,027	6,114	7,458	37
York 1	34,585,799	4,968	6,984	60
York 2	40,831,481	4,600	8,898	11
York 3	101,120,629	14,976	6,752	71
York 4	38,603,369	5,508	7,011	57
State Total	\$4,744,302,523	652,435	\$7,272	
District Median			\$7,408	

TABLE 104 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE)*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Total Current Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Bamberg 2	\$11 046 811	1,063	\$10,392	1
Allendale	18,885 772	1,822	10 385	2
Florence 4	10,501 921	1,072	9 797	3
Manon 7	9,338 837	962	9 708	4
Fairfield	34,391 500	3 625	9 487	5
McCormick	10 066 852	1 070	9 408	6
Spartanburg 7	76 881,290	8 510	9,032	7
Richland 1	231,524 424	25 673	9 018	8
Calhoun	17 562 997	1,972	8 906	9
Lee	25 546 999	2,868	8,904	10
York 2	40 931 481	4 600	8 898	11
Spartanburg 3	27 740 059	3 122	8,885	12
Orangeburg 5	64 597 016	7,298	8 851	13
Hampton 2	12 483,201	1 443	8 651	14
Dorchester 4	20 826 709	2 422	8,599	15
Georgetown	84,565 465	9 858	8 577	16
Clarendon 1	10 636 776	1,241	8,571	17
Bamwell 19	8,364,894	979	8 544	18
Orangeburg 3	30 866 886	3 660	8 434	19
Saluda	17 147,853	2,087	8,217	20
Lexington 3	18,480 469	2,264	8 163	21
Beaufort	133,950 056	16,496	8 120	22
Oconee	81 517 100	10 071	8,094	23
Lexington 2	68,934 101	8 696	7,927	24
Newberry	45 085 159	5 751	7 840	25
Jasper	22 197,384	2,839	7,819	26
Bamwell 29	7 374,279	947	7 787	27
Greenwood 51	9,312 182	1 197	7 780	28
Edgefield	30,270 144	3 826	7 710	29
Bamberg 1	12 755 419	1 671	7 633	30
Hampton 1	19,817 752	2,604	7,611	31
Orangeburg 4	31,387 047	4 137	7,587	32
Manon 2	16,251 958	2,153	7,549	33
Lexington 5	111 094,206	14 755	7,529	34
Horry	213 695,216	28,455	7 510	35
Spartanburg 1	32 862 772	4 383	7 498	36
Williamsburg	45 600 027	6 114	7 458	37
Florence 2	8 053 582	1 082	7 443	38
Florence 5	10 701 672	1 438	7 442	39
Union	38 927 872	4 967	7 435	40
Spartanburg 5	42,697,397	5 755	7 419	41
Anderson 5	82 460 533	11 118	7 417	42
Richland 2	130 772,685	17,660	7 405	43
Charleston	308 491 344	41 829	7,375	44

TABLE 104 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL, 2001-02*
(EXCLUDES CAPITAL PROJECTS AND DEBT SERVICE)*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Total Current Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Anderson 4	\$19,728,884	2,679	\$7,384	45
Florence 3	30,317,447	4,124	7,351	46
Chester	48,785,088	6,367	7,348	47
Abbeville	27,128,258	3,709	7,314	48
Darlington	82,741,343	11,415	7,248	49
Lexington 1	124,503,851	17,268	7,210	50
Cherokee	62,369,223	8,822	7,073	51
Laurens 56	23,656,293	3,349	7,064	52
Colleton	48,774,517	6,638	7,046	53
Laurens 55	40,736,154	5,791	7,034	54
Clarendon 3	8,345,381	1,189	7,019	55
Florence 1	95,504,453	13,614	7,015	56
York 4	38,603,369	5,506	7,011	57
Chesterfield	55,448,150	7,835	6,988	58
Sumter 17	60,683,082	8,689	6,984	59
York 1	34,595,799	4,968	6,984	60
Lexington 4	23,040,213	3,321	6,938	61
Dillon 1	8,204,820	901	6,887	62
Marion 1	21,873,705	3,180	6,879	63
Greenwood 30	60,527,983	8,806	6,873	64
Lancaster	74,139,321	10,801	6,864	65
Barnwell 45	18,539,885	2,702	6,862	66
Sumter 2	62,477,056	9,170	6,813	68
Berkeley	176,887,726	25,989	6,809	69
Marlboro	34,870,476	5,139	6,785	70
York 3	101,120,629	14,976	6,752	71
Anderson 2	24,229,504	3,589	6,751	72
Greenwood 52	10,919,789	1,629	6,703	73
Kershaw	64,384,932	9,666	6,661	74
Pickens	103,063,045	15,758	6,540	75
Dillon 3	9,653,434	1,486	6,498	76
Dillon 2	23,871,708	3,688	6,473	77
Spartanburg 4	18,350,466	2,852	6,434	78
Aiken	152,772,293	23,884	6,398	79
Greenville	380,013,119	59,729	6,362	80
Clarendon 2	22,314,033	3,526	6,328	81
Spartanburg 6	57,265,486	9,102	6,292	82
Anderson 3	16,172,986	2,672	6,288	83
Anderson 1	48,937,598	7,512	6,248	84
Dorchester 2	104,051,458	16,668	6,243	85
Spartanburg 2	48,091,511	8,080	5,952	86
State Total	\$4,744,302,523	652,435	\$7,272	
District Median			\$7,405	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 105
INCREASE IN CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES
PER PUPIL FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Current Operating Expenditures Per Pupil			Rank
	1998-99	2001-02	Increase	
<i>Listed Alphabetically</i>				
Aiken	\$5 770	\$7 314	\$1 544	37
Allendale	5,006	6 396	1 390	47
Anderson 1	6 832	10,365	3,533	1
Anderson 2	5 461	6,248	787	84
Anderson 3	5 831	6 751	920	79
Anderson 4	5 089	6,288	1 199	59
Anderson 5	5 979	7 364	1 385	48
Bamberg 1	5,712	7 417	1 705	23
Bamberg 2	6 407	7 633	1,226	58
Barnwell 19	7 734	10 392	2 658	5
Barnwell 29	6 549	8 544	1 995	13
Barnwell 45	6 197	7 787	1 590	30
Beaufort	5 857	6 862	1,005	74
Berkeley	6 532	8 120	1 588	31
Calhoun	5 398	6 809	1 411	46
Charleston	7,207	8 908	1,699	24
Cherokee	5 629	7 375	1 746	21
Chester	5 695	7 073	1 378	50
Chesterfield	5 750	7 348	1 598	29
Clarendon 1	5 618	6 988	1 370	51
Clarendon 2	6 517	8,571	2,054	10
Clarendon 3	5 355	6,328	973	76
Colleton	5 743	7,019	1,276	55
Darlington	5,856	7,046	1 190	60
Dillon 1	6 124	7,248	1 124	65
Dillon 2	5 737	6,887	1 150	63
Dillon 3	5,283	6 473	1 190	61
District	5 619	6 496	877	80
Dorchester 2	4 988	6,243	1,255	56
Dorchester 4	6 781	8 589	1,818	18
Edgefield	5,726	7 710	1 984	14
Fairfield	6,340	9 487	1 147	64
Florence 1	5,449	7 015	1,566	32
Florence 2	5 559	7 443	1 884	17
Florence 3	5 862	7,351	1 489	39
Florence 4	6 329	9 797	3 468	2
Florence 5	6 027	7 442	1 415	44
Georgetown	6 828	8,577	1 751	20
Greenville	5 429	6 362	933	78
Greenwood 50	6 002	6,873	871	81
Greenwood 51	5 643	7 780	2 137	8
Greenwood 52	5 688	6 703	1,015	73
Hampton 1	6 142	7 611	1 469	40
Hampton 2	6 942	8 651	1 709	22

TABLE 105 (Continued)
INCREASE IN CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES
PER PUPIL FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

<i>Listed Alphabetically</i>				
District	Current Operating Expenditures Per Pupil			Rank
	1998-99	2001-02	Increase	
Horry	\$6,448	\$7,510	\$1,064	69
Jasper	5,859	7,819	1,960	16
Kershaw	5,808	6,681	1,053	70
Lancaster	5,319	6,664	1,545	38
Laurens 55	5,479	7,034	1,555	34
Laurens 56	6,035	7,064	1,029	71
Lee	6,083	8,904	2,821	4
Lexington 1	5,582	7,210	1,628	28
Lexington 2	6,284	7,927	1,643	25
Lexington 3	6,521	8,163	1,642	26
Lexington 4	5,296	6,938	1,642	27
Lexington 6	6,118	7,529	1,413	45
McCormick	7,180	9,408	2,228	7
Marion 1	5,905	6,879	974	75
Marion 2	6,737	7,549	812	83
Marion 7	6,725	9,708	2,983	3
Marlboro	5,679	6,785	1,106	67
Newberry	6,087	7,840	1,753	19
Oconee	6,713	8,094	1,381	49
Orangeburg 3	6,458	8,434	1,976	15
Orangeburg 4	6,038	7,587	1,551	35
Orangeburg 5	6,854	8,851	1,997	12
Pickens	5,222	6,540	1,318	53
Richland 1	6,947	9,018	2,071	9
Richland 2	6,388	7,405	1,017	72
Saluda	5,971	8,217	2,246	6
Spartanburg 1	6,064	7,488	1,424	43
Spartanburg 2	5,279	5,952	673	85
Spartanburg 3	7,417	8,885	1,468	41
Spartanburg 4	5,327	6,434	1,107	66
Spartanburg 5	6,344	7,419	1,075	68
Spartanburg 6	5,340	6,282	952	77
Spartanburg 7	7,785	9,032	1,247	57
Sumter 17	5,475	6,984	1,509	38
Sumter 2	5,455	6,813	1,358	52
Union	5,885	7,435	1,440	42
Williamsburg	6,168	7,458	1,292	54
York 1	6,149	6,964	815	82
York 2	6,852	8,898	2,046	11
York 3	5,587	6,752	1,185	62
York 4	5,448	7,011	1,565	33
State Total	\$5,887	\$7,272	\$1,385	
<i>District Median</i>			\$1,434	

TABLE 105 (Continued)
 INCREASE IN CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES
 PER PUPIL FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
 BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically			Rank
	Current Operating Expenditures Per Pupil 1998-99	2001-02	Increase	
Anderson 1	\$8 832	\$10 365	\$3,533	1
Florence 4	8 329	9 797	3 468	2
Marion 7	6 725	9 708	2,983	3
Lee	6 083	8 904	2,821	4
Barnwell 19	7 734	10,392	2,658	5
Saluda	5,971	8,217	2,246	6
McCormick	7 180	9 408	2,228	7
Greenwood 51	5,643	7 780	2,137	8
Richland 1	6,947	9 018	2,071	9
Clarendon 2	8,517	8 571	2 054	10
York 2	6,852	8 896	2,046	11
Orangeburg 5	6,854	8 851	1,997	12
Barnwell 29	6,549	8 544	1 995	13
Edgefield	5,728	7 710	1 984	14
Orangeburg 3	6 458	8 434	1 976	15
Jasper	5 859	7,819	1,960	16
Florence 2	5 559	7 443	1,884	17
Dorchester 4	6,781	8 599	1,818	18
Newberry	6 087	7,840	1 753	19
Georgetown	6,828	8,577	1 751	20
Cherokee	5 629	7,375	1 748	21
Hampton 2	6,942	8,651	1 709	22
Barnberg 1	5 712	7 417	1 705	23
Charleston	7,207	8,906	1 699	24
Lexington 2	6,284	7,927	1 643	25
Lexington 3	6,521	8 163	1 642	26
Lexington 4	5,296	6,938	1 642	27
Lexington 1	5,582	7,210	1 628	28
Chesterfield	5 750	7,348	1 598	29
Barnwell 45	6,197	7 787	1 590	30
Berkeley	6,532	8,120	1,588	31
Florence 1	6,449	7 015	1,566	32
York 4	5,446	7 011	1,565	33
Laurens 55	5,479	7,034	1 555	34
Orangeburg 4	6,036	7,587	1,551	35
Lancaster	5,319	6 884	1,545	36
Aiken	5 770	7,314	1,544	37
Sumter 17	5 475	6,984	1,509	38
Florence 3	5,862	7,351	1 489	39
Hampton 1	6,142	7 611	1 469	40
Spartanburg 3	7 417	8 885	1 468	41
Union	5 995	7 435	1 440	42
Spartanburg 1	6 064	7 498	1 434	43
Florence 5	6 027	7 442	1 415	44

TABLE 105 (Continued)
INCREASE IN CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES
PER PUPIL FROM 1998-99 TO 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

District	Ranked Numerically			Rank
	Current Operating Expenditures Per Pupil 1998-99	2001-02	Increase	
Lexington 5	\$6,116	\$7,529	\$1,413	45
Calhoun	5,398	6,809	1,411	46
Abbeville	5,006	6,396	1,390	47
Anderson 5	5,979	7,364	1,385	48
Oconee	6,713	8,094	1,381	49
Chester	5,695	7,073	1,378	50
Clarendon 1	5,618	6,988	1,370	51
Sumter 2	5,455	6,813	1,358	52
Pickens	5,222	6,540	1,318	53
Williamsburg	6,166	7,458	1,292	54
Colleton	5,743	7,019	1,276	55
Dorchester 2	4,988	6,243	1,255	56
Spartanburg 7	7,785	9,032	1,247	57
Bamberg 2	6,407	7,633	1,226	58
Anderson 4	6,089	6,288	1,199	59
Darlington	5,856	7,046	1,190	60
Dillon 3	5,263	6,473	1,190	61
York 3	5,567	6,752	1,185	62
Dillon 2	5,737	6,887	1,150	63
Fairfield	6,340	7,487	1,147	64
Dillon 1	6,124	7,248	1,124	65
Spartanburg 4	5,327	6,434	1,107	66
Marlboro	5,679	6,785	1,106	67
Spartanburg 5	6,344	7,419	1,075	68
Horry	6,446	7,510	1,064	69
Kershaw	5,606	6,661	1,053	70
Laurens 56	6,035	7,064	1,029	71
Richland 2	6,388	7,405	1,017	72
Greenwood 52	6,668	6,703	1,015	73
Beaufort	5,857	6,862	1,005	74
Marion 1	5,905	6,879	874	75
Clarendon 3	5,365	6,328	973	76
Spartanburg 6	5,340	6,282	952	77
Greenville	5,429	6,362	933	78
Anderson 3	5,631	6,751	820	79
District	5,619	6,496	877	80
Greenwood 50	6,002	6,873	871	81
York 1	6,149	6,964	815	82
Marion 2	6,737	7,549	812	83
Anderson 2	5,481	6,248	787	84
Spartanburg 2	5,279	5,952	673	85
State Total	\$5,887	\$7,272	\$1,385	
District Median			\$1,434	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 106
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DISTRICT LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	District Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$994,709	3,709	\$268	29
Aiken	3,994,505	23,884	167	58
Allendale	1,211,054	1,822	665	4
Anderson 1	1,159,354	7,512	154	64
Anderson 2	1,222,704	3,589	341	20
Anderson 3	349,451	2,572	136	72
Anderson 4	716,054	2,879	267	30
Anderson 5	1,377,459	11,118	124	75
Bamberg 1	753,322	1,871	451	12
Bamberg 2	824,751	1,063	776	2
Barnwell 19	649,436	979	663	5
Barnwell 29	428,008	947	450	13
Barnwell 45	704,958	2,702	261	33
Beaufort	2,471,082	16,496	150	66
Berkeley	3,644,117	25,980	140	70
Calhoun	680,563	1,972	345	19
Charleston	7,464,181	41,829	178	53
Cherokee	1,515,132	8,822	172	57
Chester	1,480,963	6,367	233	41
Chesterfield	886,110	7,935	112	77
Clarendon 1	1,015,162	1,241	818	1
Clarendon 2	805,888	3,526	229	42
Clarendon 3	288,599	1,189	241	39
Colleton	1,154,774	6,638	174	54
Darlington	2,158,508	11,415	189	50
Dillon 1	292,277	901	324	22
Dillon 2	708,639	3,688	192	49
Dillon 3	463,581	1,486	312	25
Dorchester 2	1,063,728	18,668	64	85
Dorchester 4	1,137,699	2,422	470	11
Edgefield	1,025,764	3,826	281	32
Fairfield	1,854,492	3,625	512	10
Florence 1	2,359,979	13,614	173	56
Florence 2	360,988	1,082	334	21
Florence 3	1,200,942	4,124	291	28
Florence 4	773,878	1,072	722	3
Florence 5	342,260	1,438	238	40
Georgetown	2,385,605	9,859	242	38
Greenville	7,522,741	59,729	126	74
Greenwood 50	1,520,771	8,806	173	56
Greenwood 51	494,101	1,197	413	18
Greenwood 52	403,423	1,829	248	36
Hampton 1	995,329	2,604	382	17
Hampton 2	802,043	1,443	556	7

TABLE 106 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DISTRICT LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	District Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$2,233,452	28,455	\$78	84
Jasper	1,018,533	2,839	359	18
Kershaw	1,525,278	9,688	158	61
Lancaster	2,202,503	10,901	204	48
Laurens 55	1,729,333	5,791	299	26
Laurens 56	1,076,815	3,349	322	24
Lee	1,228,695	2,869	428	14
Lexington 1	1,573,232	17,269	91	82
Lexington 2	950,523	8,688	109	79
Lexington 3	1,253,470	2,264	554	8
Lexington 4	888,109	3,321	298	27
Lexington 5	1,840,665	14,755	111	78
McCormick	834,288	1,070	583	6
Marion 1	497,398	3,180	156	62
Marion 2	532,543	2,153	247	37
Marion 7	502,997	962	523	9
Marlboro	1,368,841	5,139	266	31
Newberry	832,017	5,751	182	80
Oconee	1,868,918	10,071	188	59
Orangeburg 3	775,171	3,660	212	44
Orangeburg 4	1,025,715	4,137	248	35
Orangeburg 5	1,584,990	7,298	217	43
Pickens	1,811,929	15,758	102	80
Richland 1	4,982,978	25,873	194	48
Richland 2	3,235,765	17,660	183	52
Saluda	888,944	2,067	418	15
Spartanburg 1	639,712	4,383	148	69
Spartanburg 2	819,825	8,080	101	81
Spartanburg 3	647,440	3,122	207	45
Spartanburg 4	527,069	2,852	185	61
Spartanburg 5	859,800	5,756	149	68
Spartanburg 6	476,852	9,102	52	88
Spartanburg 7	1,108,488	8,510	130	73
Sumter 2	1,376,988	9,170	150	65
Sumter 17	1,722,351	8,689	198	47
Union	1,606,908	4,967	324	23
Williamsburg	1,589,369	6,114	260	34
York 1	614,854	4,968	124	76
York 2	711,773	4,800	155	63
York 3	2,085,091	14,876	138	71
York 4	471,988	5,506	86	83
State Total	\$118,532,091	652,435	\$179	
District Median			\$217	

TABLE 106 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DISTRICT LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	District Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Clarendon 1	1 015 162	1 241	818	1
Bamberg 2	824 751	1 063	776	2
Florence 4	773 878	1,072	722	3
Allendale	1,211 054	1,822	665	4
Barnwell 19	649 436	979	663	5
McCormick	634,288	1 070	593	6
Hampton 2	802 043	1 443	556	7
Lexington 3	1,253 470	2,284	554	8
Marion 7	502 997	962	523	9
Fairfield	1 854 492	3,825	512	10
Dorchester 4	1 137 699	2 422	470	11
Bamberg 1	753 322	1,871	451	12
Barnwell 29	426 006	947	450	13
Lee	1,228 695	2 869	426	14
Saluda	888 944	2 087	416	15
Greenwood 51	494 101	1 197	413	16
Hampton 1	995 329	2 604	382	17
Jasper	1 018 533	2 639	359	18
Calhoun	680 563	1 972	345	19
Anderson 2	1,222 704	3 589	341	20
Florence 2	360 988	1 082	334	21
Dillon 1	292,277	901	324	22
Union	1,606 808	4,967	324	23
Laurens 58	1 076,815	3 349	322	24
Dillon 3	483 581	1 486	312	25
Laurens 55	1 729 333	5 791	299	26
Lexington 4	988 109	3 321	298	27
Florence 3	1,200 942	4 124	291	28
Abbeville	\$994 709	3 709	\$268	29
Anderson 4	718 054	2,679	267	30
Marlboro	1,368 841	5 139	266	31
Edgefield	1,025 764	3,826	261	32
Barnwell 45	704 958	2 702	261	33
Williamsburg	1,589 369	6 114	260	34
Orangeburg 4	1,025 715	4 137	248	35
Greenwood 52	403 423	1,829	248	36
Marion 2	532 543	2,153	247	37
Georgetown	2 385 805	9,859	242	38
Clarendon 3	286 599	1 189	241	39
Florence 5	342,293	1 436	238	40
Chester	1 480,963	6,367	233	41
Clarendon 2	805 888	3 526	229	42
Orangeburg 5	1 584,990	7,298	217	43
Orangeburg 3	775 171	3 660	212	44

TABLE 106 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DISTRICT LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	District Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Spartanburg 3	\$647,440	3,122	\$207	45
Lancaster	2,202,503	10,801	204	46
Sumter 17	1,722,351	8,689	198	47
Richland 1	4,982,978	25,673	194	48
Dillon 2	708,639	3,688	192	49
Darlington	2,158,506	11,415	189	50
Spartanburg 4	527,069	2,852	185	51
Richland 2	3,235,765	17,660	183	52
Charleston	7,464,181	41,829	178	53
Colleton	1,154,774	6,638	174	54
Florence 1	2,359,979	13,614	173	55
Greenwood 50	1,520,771	8,808	173	56
Cherokee	1,515,132	8,822	172	57
Aiken	3,994,505	23,884	167	58
Oconee	1,668,918	10,071	166	59
Newberry	932,017	5,751	162	60
Kershaw	1,525,278	9,668	158	61
Marion 1	497,398	3,180	156	62
York 2	711,773	4,600	155	63
Anderson 1	1,159,354	7,512	154	64
Sumter 2	1,376,988	9,170	150	65
Beaufort	2,471,082	16,496	150	66
Spartanburg 5	859,800	5,755	148	68
Spartanburg 1	639,712	4,383	148	69
Berkeley	3,644,117	25,980	140	70
York 3	2,065,081	14,976	138	71
Anderson 3	349,451	2,572	136	72
Spartanburg 7	1,106,466	8,510	130	73
Greenville	7,522,741	59,729	126	74
Anderson 5	1,377,459	11,118	124	75
York 1	614,654	4,968	124	76
Chesterfield	888,110	7,935	112	77
Lexington 5	1,840,685	14,755	111	78
Lexington 2	950,523	8,696	109	79
Pickens	1,811,928	15,758	102	80
Spartanburg 2	819,825	8,080	101	81
Lexington 1	1,573,232	17,268	91	82
York 4	471,986	5,508	88	83
Horry	2,233,452	28,455	78	84
Dorchester 2	1,063,728	16,668	64	85
Spartanburg 6	476,852	9,102	52	88
State Total	\$116,532,091	652,435	\$179	
<i>District Median</i>			\$217	

*See "References for Tables."

TABLE 107
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	School Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$1,283 152	3 709	\$348	80
Aiken	8 433 494	23 884	353	77
Allendale	849 454	1 822	466	31
Anderson 1	2,984 850	7 512	395	60
Anderson 2	1,393 831	3 589	388	83
Anderson 3	848 938	2 572	329	85
Anderson 4	832 005	2 679	348	78
Anderson 5	4 465 213	11 118	402	55
Barnberg 1	724 488	1 671	434	43
Barnberg 2	598 030	1 063	563	9
Barnwell 19	337 455	979	345	81
Barnwell 29	448 051	947	471	29
Barnwell 45	1 020 732	2 702	378	66
Beaufort	9 486 145	16 496	575	4
Berkeley	9 460 000	25 980	364	73
Cathoun	1 000 939	1 972	508	20
Charleston	17 538,207	41 829	419	48
Cherokee	3 623 403	8,822	411	53
Chester	2 429 025	6 367	382	64
Chesterfield	3 869 262	7 935	488	25
Clarendon 1	690 762	1,241	557	11
Clarendon 2	1 167 612	3 528	331	84
Clarendon 3	462 309	1 189	389	62
Colleton	3 369 859	6,638	508	19
Darlington	5 061 697	11 415	443	41
Dillon 1	365 909	901	406	54
Dillon 2	1 400 535	3,688	380	65
Dillon 3	547 419	1 488	368	71
Dorchester 2	5 795 560	16,666	348	79
Dorchester 4	1 129,375	2,422	466	30
Edgefield	1,871,275	3,926	477	26
Fairfield	1,865 677	3 625	542	14
Florence 1	5 407 511	13,614	397	58
Florence 2	482 060	1 082	448	39
Florence 3	2,181 446	4 124	529	16
Florence 4	533 858	1 072	498	21
Florence 5	630 492	1 438	438	42
Georgetown	6 093 592	9 859	618	1
Greenville	23,261 496	59 729	389	61
Greenwood 50	3 194 437	8 806	363	74
Greenwood 51	558 169	1 197	465	32
Greenwood 52	587 019	1 629	360	75
Hampton 1	1,276 918	2 604	490	24
Hampton 2	738 495	1 443	512	18

TABLE 107 (Continued)
 CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
 FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
 BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	School Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$13 551 064	28 455	\$478	28
Jasper	1 190,825	2,839	419	47
Kershaw	4 373,151	9 666	452	38
Lancaster	4 589 757	10 801	425	46
Laurens 55	2 680 125	5 791	446	38
Laurens 56	1,525 867	3 349	456	35
Lee	1 597 305	2,889	557	10
Lexington 1	5 741 040	17,268	332	83
Lexington 2	4 030 648	8,698	464	33
Lexington 3	1 009 803	2,264	446	37
Lexington 4	1,212 317	3 321	365	72
Lexington 5	6 544 812	14 755	444	40
McCormick	565 761	1 070	529	17
Manon 1	987,880	3 180	311	86
Marion 2	823,235	2 153	429	44
Marion 7	579 680	962	603	2
Marlboro	2 126 016	5 139	414	51
Newberry	3,281 401	5 751	571	6
Oconee	5 380 858	10 071	534	15
Orangeburg 3	2 078 880	3 660	568	7
Orangeburg 4	1 554 131	4 137	376	68
Orangeburg 5	4 014,911	7,298	550	13
Pickens	6,224 123	15 758	395	59
Richland 1	14 170,291	25 873	552	12
Richland 2	7 050 763	17 660	399	57
Saluda	1,233,837	2 087	591	3
Spartanburg 1	1 576 036	4,383	360	76
Spartanburg 2	3 004 545	8,080	372	69
Spartanburg 3	1 768,321	3 122	566	8
Spartanburg 4	1 400,249	2,852	491	23
Spartanburg 5	2 462,440	5 755	428	45
Spartanburg 6	3,837 605	9 102	400	56
Spartanburg 7	4,222,319	8,510	496	22
Sumter 2	3,812,217	9 170	416	49
Sumter 17	3,217,216	8 689	370	70
Union	1 685,335	4,967	339	82
Williamsburg	2 827 623	6,114	462	34
York 1	2,368,134	4,968	476	27
York 2	2 628,668	4 600	571	5
York 3	6,201 050	14 976	414	50
York 4	2,268,294	5 506	412	52
State Total	\$281 670,279	652,435	\$432	
District Median			\$434	

TABLE 107 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	School Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Georgetown	\$6 093 592	9 859	\$618	1
Manon 7	579 680	962	603	2
Saluda	1,233 637	2,067	591	3
Beaufort	9 486 145	16 496	575	4
York 2	2 628 668	4 600	571	5
Newberry	3,281 401	5 751	571	6
Orangeburg 3	2 078 880	3 660	568	7
Spartanburg 3	1 768 321	3,122	566	8
Bamberg 2	598 030	1 063	563	9
Lee	1 597 305	2,869	557	10
Clarendon 1	690 762	1,241	557	11
Richland 1	14 170,291	25 673	552	12
Orangeburg 5	4 014 911	7,298	550	13
Fairfield	1,965 677	3 625	542	14
Oconee	5 380 858	10 071	534	15
Florence 3	2 181 446	4 124	529	16
McCormick	565 761	1 070	529	17
Hampton 2	738 495	1 443	512	18
Coffeyton	3,369 859	6 638	508	19
Calhoun	1 000 939	1,972	508	20
Florence 4	533 858	1 072	498	21
Spartanburg 7	4,222 319	8 510	496	22
Spartanburg 4	1 400,249	2,852	491	23
Hampton 1	1,276 918	2 604	490	24
Chesterfield	3 869,262	7,935	488	25
Edgefield	1,871,275	3 926	477	26
York 1	2 366 134	4,968	476	27
Horry	13 651,064	28 455	476	28
Barnwell 29	446 051	947	471	29
Dorchester 4	1 129,375	2 422	466	30
Allendale	849 454	1 822	466	31
Greenwood 51	566,169	1 197	465	32
Lexington 2	4 030,648	8,696	464	33
Williamsburg	2,827,823	6 114	462	34
Laurens 56	1 525 867	3,349	458	35
Kershaw	4,373 151	9 666	452	36
Lexington 3	1 009,803	2,264	446	37
Laurens 55	2,580 125	5 791	446	38
Florence 2	482 060	1 062	446	39
Lexington 5	6,544,812	14 755	444	40
Darlington	5,061 697	11 415	443	41
Florence 5	630 492	1 438	438	42
Bamberg 1	724 488	1 671	434	43
Manon 2	823,235	2 153	429	44

TABLE 107 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	School Leadership Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Spartanburg 5	\$2 462 440	5 755	\$428	45
Lancaster	4 589 757	10,801	425	48
Jasper	1 190 825	2,839	419	47
Charleston	17 538,207	41,829	419	48
Sumter 2	3 812,217	9 170	416	49
York 3	8,201 050	14,976	414	50
Marlboro	2 128 016	5 139	414	51
York 4	2,268,294	5 508	412	52
Cherokee	3 623 403	8,822	411	53
Dillon 1	365 909	901	408	54
Anderson 5	4 485,213	11 118	402	55
Spartanburg 6	3 637 605	9 102	400	58
Richland 2	7 050 753	17,660	399	57
Florence 1	5 407 511	13,614	397	58
Pickens	6,224 123	15 758	395	59
Anderson 1	2 964 850	7,512	395	60
Greenville	23,261 496	59 729	389	61
Clarendon 3	482 309	1 189	389	62
Anderson 2	1 393 831	3,589	388	63
Chester	2,429 025	6,367	382	64
Dillon 2	1 400 835	3,688	380	65
Barnwell 45	1 020 732	2 702	378	68
Orangeburg 4	1 554 131	4 137	378	68
Spartanburg 2	3,004 545	8,080	372	69
Sumter 17	3,217,216	8 689	370	70
Dillon 3	547 419	1 486	368	71
Lexington 4	1,212,317	3,321	365	72
Berkeley	9 460 000	25,980	364	73
Greenwood 50	3 194 437	8,806	363	74
Greenwood 52	587,019	1,829	360	75
Spartanburg 1	1 576,038	4,383	360	76
Alten	8,433,494	23,884	353	77
Anderson 4	932,005	2,679	348	78
Dorchester 2	5,796,560	16,686	348	79
Abbeville	1,283 152	3,709	346	80
Barnwell 19	337 455	979	345	81
Union	1 685,335	4,867	339	82
Lexington 1	5 741,040	17,289	332	83
Clarendon 2	1 167,612	3,526	331	84
Anderson 3	846,938	2,572	329	85
Marion 1	987,880	3,180	311	88
State Total	\$281 670,279	852,435	\$432	
District Median			\$434	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 108
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Instruction & Support Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$19 822,002	3 709	\$5,344	43
Aiken	112 685,353	23 884	4 718	77
Allendale	12,757 728	1 822	7 002	1
Anderson 1	35 052 966	7 512	4 668	79
Anderson 2	17,371 178	3 589	4 840	70
Anderson 3	11 903 787	2 572	4 628	81
Anderson 4	13 695 547	2 879	5,112	54
Anderson 5	60 985 072	11 118	5 485	33
Bamberg 1	8 711 460	1 671	5,213	48
Bamberg 2	7 187 187	1 063	6 761	4
Barnwell 19	5,819,611	979	5,944	15
Barnwell 29	4,986 639	947	5,268	45
Barnwell 45	13 730 580	2 702	5 082	58
Beaufort	98 487 559	18 486	5 849	19
Berkeley	128 620 987	25 980	4 951	65
Calhoun	12 553 988	1 972	8,388	11
Charleston	225 837 559	41 829	5 401	40
Cherokee	44 476,358	8 822	5 042	61
Chester	34,836 947	6 387	5,471	34
Chesterfield	40,757 095	7,935	5,136	52
Clarendon 1	6,947,244	1,241	5,598	25
Clarendon 2	18,177 462	3,526	4,588	82
Clarendon 3	6,050 025	1 189	5,088	56
Colleton	33,098 477	6 638	4 986	64
Darlington	61 053 629	11 415	5,349	42
Dillon 1	4 300,610	901	4 773	72
Dillon 2	18,226 091	3 688	4 400	84
Dillon 3	7,011 611	1 486	4 718	76
Dorchester 2	78 105,487	16 668	4,887	78
Dorchester 4	14,408,864	2,422	5,849	14
Edgefield	21,336 443	3 928	5,435	39
Fairfield	21 834 013	3 825	6,023	13
Florence 1	71 658 837	13 614	5,284	46
Florence 2	5 653,187	1 082	5,225	47
Florence 3	20,839 068	4 124	5,053	59
Florence 4	7 450 192	1 072	6,950	2
Florence 5	7,852 827	1 438	5,481	37
Georgetown	58,431 539	9,859	5 827	18
Greenville	277 001 188	59 728	4 638	80
Greenwood 50	45 588,255	8 806	5 177	50
Greenwood 51	8 528 099	1 197	5,454	38
Greenwood 52	8,282 855	1 629	5,885	57
Hampton 1	14 477 765	2 604	5 580	27
Hampton 2	8,226 664	1 443	5 701	22

TABLE 108 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Instruction & Support Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$165,438,134	28,455	\$5,483	38
Jasper	15,604,969	2,839	5,497	31
Kershaw	48,172,842	9,668	4,777	71
Lancaster	54,338,388	10,801	5,031	62
Laurens 55	29,224,714	5,791	5,047	60
Laurens 58	18,570,658	3,349	4,948	68
Lee	18,273,784	2,869	6,369	10
Lexington 1	94,416,832	17,268	5,488	35
Lexington 2	51,145,137	8,698	5,881	17
Lexington 3	12,782,885	2,264	5,848	23
Lexington 4	15,818,983	3,321	4,783	73
Lexington 5	81,878,851	14,755	5,549	28
McCormick	7,077,028	1,070	6,814	7
Marion 1	18,357,009	3,180	5,144	51
Marion 2	11,919,889	2,153	5,536	29
Marion 7	6,511,591	962	6,788	3
Marlboro	24,298,482	5,139	4,728	74
Newberry	32,082,909	5,761	5,579	26
Oconee	58,637,580	10,071	5,822	20
Orangeburg 3	21,488,313	3,660	5,871	18
Orangeburg 4	22,329,268	4,137	5,397	41
Orangeburg 5	47,531,696	7,288	6,513	9
Pickens	78,853,583	15,758	4,884	68
Richland 1	168,002,582	25,673	6,544	8
Richland 2	91,830,203	17,660	5,200	49
Seluda	11,517,181	2,087	5,519	30
Spartanburg 1	25,122,862	4,383	5,732	21
Spartanburg 2	34,845,875	8,080	4,313	85
Spartanburg 3	19,878,226	3,122	6,303	12
Spartanburg 4	13,016,717	2,852	4,584	83
Spartanburg 5	32,344,814	5,755	5,820	24
Spartanburg 6	42,960,302	9,102	4,720	75
Spartanburg 7	57,418,979	8,510	6,747	5
Sumter 2	45,005,180	9,170	4,908	67
Sumter 17	44,469,982	8,689	5,117	53
Union	27,278,982	4,967	5,482	32
Williamsburg	32,239,953	6,114	5,273	44
York 1	25,345,308	4,988	5,102	55
York 2	30,448,063	4,600	6,819	6
York 3	72,530,341	14,978	4,843	69
York 4	27,558,773	5,508	5,005	63
State Total	\$3,445,069,599	652,435	\$5,280	
District Median			\$5,344	

TABLE 108 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Instruction & Support Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Allendale	\$12,757,728	1,822	\$7,002	1
Florence 4	7,450,192	1,072	6,950	2
Manon 7	6,511,591	962	6,769	3
Bamberg 2	7,187,167	1,063	6,781	4
Spartanburg 7	57,418,979	8,510	6,747	5
York 2	30,446,063	4,600	6,619	6
McCormick	7,077,028	1,070	6,614	7
Richland 1	168,002,582	25,673	6,544	8
Orangeburg 5	47,531,696	7,298	6,513	9
Lee	18,273,784	2,869	6,369	10
Calhoun	12,553,986	1,972	6,366	11
Spartanburg 3	19,678,226	3,122	6,303	12
Fairfield	21,834,013	3,625	6,023	13
Dorchester 4	14,408,884	2,422	5,949	14
Barnwell 19	5,819,611	979	5,944	15
Georgetown	58,431,539	9,859	5,927	16
Lexington 2	51,145,137	8,696	5,881	17
Orangeburg 3	21,488,313	3,660	5,871	18
Beaufort	96,487,559	16,498	5,849	19
Oconee	58,637,560	10,071	5,822	20
Spartanburg 1	25,122,862	4,383	5,732	21
Hampton 2	8,228,684	1,443	5,701	22
Lexington 3	12,782,885	2,284	5,648	23
Spartanburg 5	32,344,814	5,765	5,620	24
Clarendon 1	6,947,244	1,241	5,598	25
Newberry	32,082,909	5,751	5,579	26
Hampton 1	14,477,765	2,604	5,560	27
Lexington 5	81,878,851	14,755	5,549	28
Marion 2	11,919,869	2,153	5,536	29
Saluda	11,517,181	2,067	5,519	30
Jasper	15,604,969	2,839	5,497	31
Union	27,278,982	4,967	5,492	32
Anderson 5	60,985,072	11,118	5,485	33
Chester	34,838,947	6,367	5,471	34
Lexington 1	94,416,832	17,268	5,468	35
Horry	155,438,134	28,455	5,463	36
Florence 5	7,852,827	1,438	5,461	37
Greenwood 51	8,628,099	1,197	5,454	38
Edgefield	21,338,443	3,926	5,435	39
Charleston	225,937,559	41,829	5,401	40
Orangeburg 4	22,329,268	4,137	5,397	41
Darlington	81,053,629	11,415	5,349	42
Abbeville	19,822,002	3,709	5,344	43
Williamsburg	32,239,953	6,114	5,273	44

TABLE 108 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Instruction & Support 2001-02 ADM Expenditures	(K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Barnwell 29	\$4,988 839	947	\$5,286	45
Florence 1	71 658 837	13 614	5,264	46
Florence 2	5 653 187	1 082	5,225	47
Bamberg 1	8 711 460	1,871	5,213	48
Richland 2	91 830,203	17 660	5,200	49
Greenwood 50	45 588,255	8 806	5 177	50
Manon 1	18,357 009	3 180	5 144	51
Chesterfield	40 757 095	7 936	5 138	52
Sumter 17	44 459 982	8 689	5,117	53
Anderson 4	13,695 547	2 679	5,112	54
York 1	25,345,308	4 968	5,102	55
Clarendon 3	8 050 025	1 189	5,088	56
Greenwood 52	8,282 855	1 629	5,085	57
Barnwell 45	13 730 580	2 702	5,082	58
Florence 3	20 839 068	4 124	5,053	59
Laurens 55	29,224 714	5 791	5 047	60
Cherokee	44 476,358	8 822	5,042	61
Lancaster	54 338,388	10,801	5,031	62
York 4	27 556,773	5,506	5,005	63
Colleton	33 098 477	6,638	4 998	64
Berkley	128 620 987	23,980	4 951	65
Laurens 56	16 570 658	3,349	4 948	66
Sumter 2	45 005 180	9 170	4 908	67
Pickens	78 653 583	16 758	4 884	68
York 3	72 530 341	14 978	4 843	69
Anderson 2	17 371 178	3,589	4 840	70
Kershaw	48,172,842	9 668	4 777	71
Dillon 1	4 300 610	901	4 773	72
Lexington 4	15 816 963	3,321	4 763	73
Marlboro	24,298 482	5,139	4 728	74
Spartanburg 6	42,960 302	9 102	4 720	75
Dillon 3	7 011 611	1 488	4 718	76
Aiken	112,685,353	23,884	4 718	77
Dorchester 2	78,105 487	16,666	4 687	78
Anderson 1	35,052 966	7 512	4,666	79
Greenville	277 001 188	59 729	4,638	80
Anderson 3	11 903 787	2,572	4,628	81
Clarendon 2	16 177 462	3,526	4,588	82
Spartanburg 4	13 016 717	2,852	4,564	83
Dillon 2	16,226 091	3 688	4 400	84
Spartanburg 2	34,845 675	8,080	4,313	85
State Total	\$3,445,069 599	652,435	\$5,280	
District Median			\$5,344	

*See References for Tables.

TABLE 109
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR TEACHER
IN-SERVICE AND TRAINING 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Teacher In-Service & Training Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$0	3 709	\$0	84
Aiken	842 852	23 884	35	54
Allendale	245,004	1 822	134	6
Anderson 1	214 311	7 512	29	63
Anderson 2	113 473	3 589	32	57
Anderson 3	51 576	2 572	20	70
Anderson 4	89 758	2 879	34	58
Anderson 5	1 034 136	11 118	93	17
Bamberg 1	29 871	1 671	18	78
Bamberg 2	194 581	1 063	183	3
Barnwell 19	104 555	979	107	13
Barnwell 29	41 840	947	44	41
Barnwell 45	59 103	2 702	22	67
Beaufort	1 101 706	16 496	67	25
Berkeley	3 344 250	25 980	129	9
Cathoun	0	1 972	0	85
Charleston	1 280 133	41 829	31	60
Cherokee	220 493	8 822	26	85
Chester	86,209	6 387	14	80
Chesterfield	227 303	7 935	29	62
Clarendon 1	112 076	1,241	90	19
Clarendon 2	104,361	3,526	30	61
Clarendon 3	14 753	1 189	12	82
Colleton	114 519	6,638	17	79
Darlington	438 154	11 415	38	50
Dillon 1	41 798	901	46	37
Dillon 2	202,266	3 888	55	29
Dillon 3	132 799	1 486	89	20
Dorchester 2	325,306	16 866	20	74
Dorchester 4	123,544	2 422	51	30
Edgefield	77,208	3 828	20	72
Fairfield	164,262	3 625	46	39
Florence 1	674 482	13 614	50	32
Florence 2	41 804	1 082	39	49
Florence 3	174 967	4 124	42	43
Florence 4	148 576	1 072	137	5
Florence 5	59 852	1 438	42	48
Georgetown	878 810	9,859	89	21
Greenville	2 585 087	59 729	43	42
Greenwood 50	372 351	8 806	42	44
Greenwood 51	89 737	1 197	75	23
Greenwood 52	149 137	1 629	92	18
Hampton 1	48 858	2 604	19	75
Hampton 2	268 742	1 443	188	2

TABLE 109 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR TEACHER
IN-SERVICE AND TRAINING, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Teacher In-Service & Training Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$1,272,645	28,455	\$45	40
Jasper	55,536	2,839	20	73
Kershaw	251,388	9,886	26	64
Lancaster	428,986	10,801	40	47
Laurens 55	287,821	5,791	48	38
Laurens 58	212,550	3,349	63	27
Lee	371,908	2,869	130	8
Lexington 1	1,025,847	17,268	59	28
Lexington 2	274,448	8,696	32	58
Lexington 3	44,788	2,284	20	71
Lexington 4	80,730	3,321	24	68
Lexington 5	508,064	14,755	34	55
McCormick	73,948	1,070	69	24
Marion 1	148,105	3,180	47	38
Marion 2	78,646	2,153	37	52
Marion 7	188,831	962	176	4
Marlboro	500,615	5,139	97	16
Newberry	227,665	5,751	40	48
Oconee	425,630	10,071	42	45
Orangeburg 3	470,918	3,660	129	10
Orangeburg 4	202,258	4,137	49	34
Orangeburg 5	896,224	7,298	123	11
Pickens	489,972	15,758	31	59
Richland 1	5,051,271	25,873	197	1
Richland 2	849,838	17,660	48	35
Saluda	44,035	2,087	21	69
Spartanburg 1	58,115	4,383	13	81
Spartanburg 2	303,852	8,080	38	51
Spartanburg 3	411,601	3,122	132	7
Spartanburg 4	291,879	2,852	102	15
Spartanburg 5	286,071	5,755	50	31
Spartanburg 6	330,569	8,102	38	53
Spartanburg 7	929,711	8,510	109	12
Sumter 2	693,985	9,170	78	22
Sumter 17	186,916	8,689	22	68
Union	78,721	4,967	18	79
Williamsburg	391,248	6,114	64	28
York 1	508,560	4,868	102	14
York 2	48,340	4,600	10	83
York 3	260,383	14,978	17	77
York 4	271,750	5,506	49	33
State Total	\$38,072,799	652,435	\$55	
District Median			\$42	

TABLE 109 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR TEACHER
IN-SERVICE AND TRAINING 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Teacher In-Service & Training Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Richland 1	\$5,051,271	25,873	\$197	1
Hampton 2	268,742	1,443	186	2
Barnberg 2	194,561	1,063	183	3
Marion 7	168,831	962	176	4
Florence 4	146,576	1,072	137	5
Allendale	245,004	1,822	134	6
Spartanburg 3	411,601	3,122	132	7
Lee	371,908	2,869	130	8
Berkeley	3,344,250	25,980	129	9
Orangeburg 3	470,916	3,660	129	10
Orangeburg 5	896,224	7,298	123	11
Spartanburg 7	929,711	8,510	109	12
Barnwell 19	104,555	979	107	13
York 1	508,560	4,968	102	14
Spartanburg 4	291,879	2,852	102	15
Marlboro	500,615	5,139	97	16
Anderson 5	1,034,136	11,118	93	17
Greenwood 52	149,137	1,629	92	18
Clarendon 1	112,076	1,241	90	19
Dillon 3	132,799	1,486	89	20
Georgetown	878,810	9,859	89	21
Sumter 2	693,985	9,170	76	22
Greenwood 51	89,737	1,197	75	23
McCormick	73,948	1,070	69	24
Beaufort	1,101,706	16,496	67	25
Williamsburg	391,248	6,114	64	26
Laurens 56	212,550	3,349	63	27
Lexington 1	1,025,847	17,268	59	28
Dillon 2	202,268	3,688	55	29
Dorchester 4	123,544	2,422	51	30
Spartanburg 5	288,071	5,755	50	31
Florence 1	674,482	13,614	50	32
York 4	271,750	5,506	49	33
Orangeburg 4	202,256	4,137	49	34
Richland 2	849,836	17,660	48	35
Marion 1	148,105	3,180	47	36
Dillon 1	41,799	901	46	37
Laurens 55	267,921	5,791	46	38
Fairfield	164,262	3,625	45	39
Horry	1,272,645	28,455	45	40
Barnwell 29	41,840	947	44	41
Greenville	2,565,067	59,729	43	42
Florence 3	174,967	4,124	42	43
Greenwood 50	372,351	8,806	42	44

TABLE 109 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR TEACHER
IN-SERVICE AND TRAINING 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Teacher In-Service & Training Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Oconee	\$425,630	10 071	\$42	45
Florence 5	59,852	1 438	42	46
Lancaster	428,886	10 801	40	47
Newberry	227,665	5 751	40	48
Florence 2	41 804	1 082	39	49
Darlington	438,154	11 415	38	50
Spartanburg 2	303,852	8 080	38	51
Marion 2	78,848	2 153	37	52
Spartanburg 6	330 569	8 102	36	53
Aiken	842,652	23 884	35	54
Lexington 5	508,084	14 755	34	55
Anderson 4	89 758	2,679	34	56
Anderson 2	113 473	3,589	32	57
Lexington 2	274 448	8 698	32	58
Pickens	489 972	15,758	31	59
Charleston	1,280 133	41 829	31	60
Clarendon 2	104 361	3 528	30	61
Chesterfield	227 303	7 935	29	62
Anderson 1	214,311	7 512	29	63
Kershaw	251,368	9 668	26	64
Cherokee	220,493	8 822	25	65
Lexington 4	80 730	3,321	24	66
Barnwell 46	59 103	2 702	22	67
Sumter 17	188,816	8 689	22	68
Saluda	44 035	2 087	21	69
Anderson 3	51 576	2 572	20	70
Lexington 3	44,788	2,264	20	71
Edgefield	77,206	3 928	20	72
Jasper	53,536	2 839	20	73
Dorchester 2	325,306	18 666	20	74
Hampton 1	48,858	2 604	19	75
Bamberg 1	29,871	1 671	18	76
York 3	260,383	14,978	17	77
Colleton	114,519	6 638	17	78
Union	78,721	4,967	16	79
Chester	88,209	6 367	14	80
Spartanburg 1	58 115	4,383	13	81
Clarendon 3	14 753	1 189	12	82
York 2	48,340	4 600	10	83
Abbeville	0	3 709	0	84
Calhoun	0	1 972	0	85
State Total	\$36,072,799	652,435	\$55	
<i>District Median</i>			\$42	

*See "References for Tables."

TABLE 110
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR BUILDING
UPKEEP AND MAINTENANCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Building Upkeep & Maintenance		Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
	Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)		
Abbeville	\$2 121,877	3 709	\$572	51
Aiken	12,681 071	23 884	531	64
Allendale	1,614 453	1 822	886	2
Anderson 1	3,260 053	7 512	434	82
Anderson 2	1 788 640	3 589	498	75
Anderson 3	1 014 494	2 572	394	86
Anderson 4	1 987,219	2 679	734	15
Anderson 5	5 996,878	11 118	539	61
Bamberg 1	1 109,308	1,871	664	29
Bamberg 2	928,585	1,063	874	3
Barnwell 19	660,240	979	674	28
Barnwell 29	712,863	947	753	12
Barnwell 45	1 150 171	2 702	426	84
Beaufort	13 697,211	16 496	830	6
Berkeley	18 130 314	25,980	698	22
Calhoun	1 353 560	1,972	686	23
Charleston	29,878 740	41,829	714	20
Cherokee	5 026 133	8,822	570	52
Chester	3,373 173	6,367	530	65
Chesterfield	4 474 428	7,935	564	54
Clarendon 1	801 339	1,241	648	35
Clarendon 2	1,502 704	3,526	426	83
Clarendon 3	648 968	1 189	546	60
Colleton	4,265 366	6 638	643	38
Darlington	5 659 571	11 415	496	76
Dillon 1	482,358	901	513	73
Dillon 2	2 050,293	3 688	558	58
Dillon 3	606,231	1 488	408	85
Dorchester 2	9,240,284	18 666	554	57
Dorchester 4	1 580 401	2 422	653	33
Edgefield	2,923 820	3 926	745	14
Fairfield	3 845,340	3 625	1 008	1
Florence 1	7 443,138	13 614	547	59
Florence 2	840 112	1 082	776	10
Florence 3	2,568,538	4 124	623	45
Florence 4	784 735	1 072	732	17
Florence 5	942,265	1 438	655	32
Georgetown	8,222,744	9 859	834	5
Greenville	31,368 835	59 729	525	66
Greenwood 50	4 566,277	8 806	519	71
Greenwood 51	872 542	1 197	729	18
Greenwood 52	768,211	1 629	472	78
Hampton 1	1 139 472	2 604	438	81
Hampton 2	947,240	1 443	658	31

TABLE 110 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR BUILDING
UPKEEP AND MAINTENANCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Building Upkeep & Maintenance Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$18,075,376	28,455	\$585	53
Jasper	1,850,417	2,839	652	34
Kershaw	4,667,908	9,666	483	77
Lancaster	5,535,279	10,801	512	74
Laurens 55	3,087,170	5,791	533	83
Laurens 56	1,743,660	3,349	521	70
Lee	1,850,641	2,869	645	36
Lexington 1	9,569,794	17,268	554	58
Lexington 2	5,461,626	8,696	628	43
Lexington 3	1,443,879	2,264	638	41
Lexington 4	1,961,424	3,321	597	50
Lexington 5	9,728,339	14,755	659	30
McCormick	848,948	1,070	793	9
Marion 1	1,490,136	3,180	469	79
Marion 2	1,127,458	2,153	524	69
Manon 7	693,744	962	721	19
Marlboro	3,119,168	5,139	607	49
Newberry	3,690,763	5,751	642	40
Oconee	7,505,878	10,071	745	13
Orangeburg 3	2,357,612	3,660	644	37
Orangeburg 4	2,760,681	4,137	667	28
Orangeburg 5	4,635,942	7,296	635	42
Pickens	7,381,089	15,758	468	80
Richland 1	19,626,638	25,673	764	11
Richland 2	14,153,929	17,660	801	7
Selma	1,408,423	2,087	675	25
Spartanburg 1	2,963,532	4,383	676	24
Spartanburg 2	4,326,382	8,080	535	62
Spartanburg 3	2,289,498	3,122	733	16
Spartanburg 4	1,494,558	2,852	524	68
Spartanburg 5	3,877,547	5,755	674	27
Spartanburg 6	4,690,155	9,102	515	72
Spartanburg 7	6,758,530	8,510	794	8
Sumter 2	5,891,731	9,170	643	39
Sumter 17	5,279,881	8,689	608	48
Union	2,782,379	4,967	560	55
Williamsburg	3,815,951	6,114	624	44
York 1	3,040,914	4,968	612	47
York 2	3,893,316	4,600	848	4
York 3	10,532,778	14,976	703	21
York 4	3,414,182	5,506	620	46
State Total	\$403,632,645	652,435	\$619	
District Median			\$628	

TABLE 110 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR BUILDING
UPKEEP AND MAINTENANCE 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Building Upkeep & Maintenance Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Fairfield	\$3 645 340	3 625	\$1 006	1
Allendale	1 614 453	1,822	886	2
Bamberg 2	928 585	1 063	874	3
York 2	3 893,316	4 600	846	4
Georgetown	8,222 744	9,859	834	5
Beaufort	13 697,211	18 496	830	6
Richland 2	14 153 829	17,660	801	7
Spartanburg 7	6 758 530	8,510	794	8
McCormick	848,948	1 070	793	9
Florence 2	840 112	1 082	776	10
Richland 1	19 628 638	25,673	764	11
Barnwell 29	712,663	947	753	12
Oconee	7 505 878	10 071	745	13
Edgefield	2 923,820	3 926	745	14
Anderson 4	1 967,219	2 679	734	15
Spartanburg 3	2,289 498	3 122	733	16
Florence 4	784 735	1 072	732	17
Greenwood 51	872 542	1 197	729	18
Marion 7	693 744	962	721	19
Charleston	29 878 740	41,829	714	20
York 3	10 532 778	14,976	703	21
Berkeley	18 130 314	25 980	698	22
Calhoun	1 353 560	1,972	686	23
Spartanburg 1	2 963 532	4 383	676	24
Saluda	1 408,423	2 087	675	25
Barnwell 19	660,240	979	674	26
Spartanburg 5	3 877 547	5 755	674	27
Orangeburg 4	2 760 681	4 137	667	28
Bamberg 1	1 109,308	1 671	664	29
Lexington 5	9 728,339	14 755	659	30
Hampton 2	947,240	1 443	656	31
Florence 5	942,265	1 438	655	32
Dorchester 4	1,580 401	2 422	653	33
Jasper	1 850 417	2,839	652	34
Clarendon 1	801 339	1,241	646	35
Lee	1 850 641	2 889	645	36
Orangeburg 3	2 357 812	3 660	644	37
Colleton	4,265,366	6 638	643	38
Sumter 2	5 891 731	9 170	643	39
Newberry	3 690 763	5 751	642	40
Lexington 3	1 443 979	2,264	638	41
Orangeburg 5	4 635 942	7,298	635	42
Lexington 2	5 461 626	8 696	628	43
Williamsburg	3 815 951	6 114	624	44

TABLE 110 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR BUILDING
UPKEEP AND MAINTENANCE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Building Upkeep & Maintenance Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Florence 3	\$2 568 538	4 124	\$623	45
York 4	3 414 182	5 508	620	46
York 1	3,040 914	4 968	612	47
Sumter 17	5,279 881	8 689	608	48
Marlboro	3 119 168	5 139	607	49
Lexington 4	1 981 424	3 321	597	50
Abbeville	2 121,977	3 709	572	51
Cherokee	5 026 133	8,822	570	52
Horry	18,075,378	28 455	585	53
Chesterfield	4 474 428	7,938	564	54
Union	2 782,379	4,967	560	55
Dillon 2	2,050,293	3 688	556	56
Dorchester 2	9,240,284	16,868	554	57
Lexington 1	9 569 794	17,268	554	58
Florence 1	7 443 138	13,614	547	59
Clarendon 3	648 966	1 189	546	60
Anderson 5	5,996 878	11 118	539	61
Spartanburg 2	4 325 382	8 080	535	62
Laurens 55	3 087 170	5 791	533	63
Aiken	12 681 071	23,884	531	64
Chester	3 373 173	6 387	530	65
Greenville	31,368 835	59 729	525	68
Spartanburg 4	1 494 558	2,852	524	68
Marion 2	1 127 458	2,153	524	69
Laurens 56	1 743 660	3 349	521	70
Greenwood 50	4 566,277	8,808	519	71
Spartanburg 6	4 690 155	9 102	515	72
Dillon 1	462,358	901	513	73
Lancaster	5,535,279	10,801	512	74
Anderson 2	1 788 640	3 589	498	75
Darlington	5 659 571	11,415	498	78
Kershaw	4,887,908	9,668	483	77
Greenwood 52	768,211	1,629	472	78
Manon 1	1,490 138	3,180	469	79
Pickens	7,381 089	15,758	468	80
Hampton 1	1 139 472	2,604	438	81
Anderson 1	3,280 053	7,512	434	82
Clarendon 2	1,502 704	3 528	426	83
Barnwell 45	1 150 171	2,702	426	84
Dillon 3	806,231	1 488	408	85
Anderson 3	1,014 494	2,572	394	86
State Total	\$403 832 645	852,435	\$819	
District Median			\$628	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 111
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR PUPIL FOOD SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Food Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$1 632 008	3 709	\$440	34
Aiken	7 447 532	23 884	312	81
Allendale	1 189,223	1 822	653	2
Anderson 1	2 429 011	7 512	323	79
Anderson 2	1 373 055	3 589	383	58
Anderson 3	1 025 787	2,572	399	51
Anderson 4	915 418	2,679	342	74
Anderson 5	4,207 782	11 118	378	59
Barnberg 1	837,282	1 671	501	15
Barnberg 2	795 732	1 063	749	1
Barnwell 19	577,901	979	590	3
Barnwell 29	399 426	947	422	41
Barnwell 45	1 159 159	2 702	429	39
Beaufort	5 439 662	16 496	330	78
Berkeley	9 046 389	25 980	348	72
Calhoun	1 054 481	1,972	535	9
Charleston	14 979 952	41,829	358	68
Cherokee	3 903,047	8,822	442	32
Chester	1 815 022	6,367	285	85
Chesterfield	3 126,302	7,835	394	54
Clarendon 1	684 448	1,241	552	6
Clarendon 2	1 512 188	3 526	429	40
Clarendon 3	536,282	1 189	451	29
Colleton	2 724 600	6 638	410	46
Darlington	4 928 663	11 415	432	37
Dillon 1	474 680	901	527	11
Dillon 2	1 741 911	3,688	472	21
Dillon 3	608 149	1 486	409	47
Dorchester 2	4 437 435	10,666	268	86
Dorchester 4	1,203,954	2,422	497	17
Edgefield	1 691 893	3 928	431	38
Fairfield	1 797 076	3 625	496	18
Florence 1	5 108 431	13 614	375	61
Florence 2	454,885	1 082	420	42
Florence 3	1,835 710	4 124	445	31
Florence 4	523 471	1 072	488	20
Florence 5	622 443	1 438	433	38
Georgetown	4 354 370	9,859	442	33
Greenville	21 360 142	58 729	358	69
Greenwood 50	3,331,268	8,806	378	60
Greenwood 51	492 789	1 197	412	44
Greenwood 52	606 724	1 829	372	62
Hampton 1	1 401 035	2,604	538	7
Hampton 2	814 168	1 443	564	5

TABLE 111 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR PUPIL FOOD SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Food Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$11 688,278	28,455	\$411	45
Jasper	1 331,938	2,839	469	23
Kershaw	3 928 334	9 666	406	48
Lancaster	3 753 113	10 801	347	73
Laurens 55	2 087 717	5,791	361	68
Laurens 56	1 541 074	3 349	460	28
Lee	1 518,591	2,889	529	10
Lexington 1	5 445,801	17,268	315	80
Lexington 2	3 085,744	8,696	355	71
Lexington 3	1 155,606	2,264	510	14
Lexington 4	1 458,180	3,321	438	35
Lexington 5	5 343,135	14 755	362	65
McCormick	496 944	1 070	484	26
Marion 1	1 563 564	3,180	492	19
Marion 2	1 009 758	2 153	469	24
Marion 7	561 454	962	584	4
Marlboro	2 044 351	5,139	398	53
Newberry	2 711 681	5 751	472	22
Oconee	4 014 945	10 071	399	52
Orangeburg 3	1 688 508	3,660	461	27
Orangeburg 4	2 126 376	4 137	514	13
Orangeburg 5	3 918,520	7,298	537	8
Pickens	5 361 395	15,758	340	76
Richland 1	9 342,142	25,873	364	64
Richland 2	5,205,543	17 660	295	84
Saluda	1 075 338	2,087	515	12
Spartanburg 1	1 557,250	4,383	355	70
Spartanburg 2	2 725,241	8,080	337	77
Spartanburg 3	1,265,751	3,122	405	49
Spartanburg 4	1 105,757	2 852	388	58
Spartanburg 5	2,101 134	5,755	365	63
Spartanburg 6	2 789,354	9 102	306	82
Spartanburg 7	3,520,841	8,510	414	43
Sumter 2	3 603,652	9 170	393	55
Sumter 17	4 063,178	8,889	468	25
Union	2,219,604	4,987	447	30
Williamsburg	3 058,211	6,114	500	16
York 1	1,902,860	4 988	383	57
York 2	1 844,993	4 600	401	50
York 3	5 108,280	14,978	341	75
York 4	1 635,998	5,506	297	83
State Total	\$248,577,999	652,435	\$381	
<i>District Median</i>			\$414	

TABLE 111 (Continued)
 CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
 FOR PUPIL FOOD SERVICE 2001-02*
 BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Food Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Barnberg 2	\$795,732	1 063	\$749	1
Allendale	1 189,223	1 822	653	2
Barnwell 19	577 901	979	590	3
Manon 7	581 454	962	584	4
Hampton 2	814 168	1 443	564	5
Clarendon 1	684 448	1,241	552	6
Hampton 1	1 401 035	2 604	538	7
Orangeburg 6	3 918 520	7,298	537	8
Cathoun	1 054 481	1 972	535	9
Lee	1 518,581	2,869	529	10
Dillon 1	474,680	901	527	11
Seluda	1 075,338	2,087	515	12
Orangeburg 4	2 126,375	4 137	514	13
Lexington 3	1 155 806	2 284	510	14
Barnberg 1	837,262	1 671	501	15
Williamsburg	3 059,211	6 114	500	16
Dorchester 4	1,203,854	2 422	497	17
Fairfield	1 797,076	3 625	496	18
Manon 1	1 583 564	3 180	492	19
Florence 4	523 471	1 072	488	20
Dillon 2	1 741,911	3 688	472	21
Newberry	2 711 661	5 751	472	22
Jasper	1,331,938	2 839	469	23
Marion 2	1 009 758	2 153	469	24
Sumter 17	4 063 176	8 689	468	25
McCormick	498,944	1 070	464	26
Orangeburg 3	1 888,506	3 660	461	27
Laurens 56	1,541 074	3 349	460	28
Clarendon 3	536,262	1 189	451	29
Union	2,219 604	4 967	447	30
Florence 3	1,835 710	4 124	445	31
Cherokee	3,903,047	8,822	442	32
Georgetown	4,354,370	9,859	442	33
Abbeville	1 832,008	3 709	440	34
Lexington 4	1 456 180	3 321	438	35
Florence 5	622,443	1 438	433	36
Darlington	4 928,663	11 415	432	37
Edgefield	1 691,693	3,926	431	38
Barnwell 45	1 159 159	2 702	429	39
Clarendon 2	1 512,188	3,528	429	40
Barnwell 29	399 426	947	422	41
Florence 2	454 885	1 082	420	42
Spartanburg 7	3 520 841	8 510	414	43
Greenwood 51	492,789	1 197	412	44

TABLE 111 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR PUPIL FOOD SERVICE 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Food Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$11 688,276	28 455	\$411	45
Colleton	2,724 800	6 638	410	46
Dillon 3	608 149	1 488	409	47
Kershaw	3 826,334	9,666	408	48
Spartanburg 3	1,265 751	3 122	405	49
York 2	1 844,993	4 600	401	50
Anderson 3	1 025,797	2,572	399	51
Oconee	4 014 945	10 071	399	52
Marlboro	2,044,351	5 139	398	53
Chesterfield	3 126,302	7,835	394	54
Sumter 2	3 603,852	9 170	393	55
Spartanburg 4	1 105,757	2 852	388	56
York 1	1 902 860	4 968	383	57
Anderson 2	1 373 055	3 589	383	58
Anderson 5	4,207 782	11 118	378	59
Greenwood 50	3,331,266	8,806	378	60
Florence 1	5,108 431	13,614	375	61
Greenwood 52	608 724	1 629	372	62
Spartanburg 5	2,101 134	5 755	365	63
Richland 1	9 342,142	25,673	364	64
Lexington 5	5,343 135	14 768	362	65
Laurens 55	2,087 717	5,791	361	66
Charleston	14,979,952	41 829	358	68
Greenville	21 380,142	59 729	358	69
Spartanburg 1	1 557,250	4 383	355	70
Lexington 2	3 085,744	8 696	355	71
Berkeley	9 048,389	26,980	348	72
Lancaster	3 753,113	10 801	347	73
Anderson 4	915,418	2 679	342	74
York 3	5 108,280	14 978	341	75
Pickens	5,381,395	15,758	340	76
Spartanburg 2	2 725,241	8 080	337	77
Beaufort	5 439 882	16 496	330	78
Anderson 1	2 429,011	7 512	323	79
Lexington 1	5,445,801	17,268	315	80
Aiken	7 447,532	23 884	312	81
Spartanburg 6	2 789,354	9 102	308	82
York 4	1 635,988	5,508	297	83
Richland 2	5,205,543	17 660	295	84
Chester	1 815 022	6 387	285	85
Dorchester 2	4 437 435	16 668	268	86
State Total	\$248,577,999	652,435	\$381	
District Median			\$414	

*See "References for Tables"

TABLE 112
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR TRANSPORTATION 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically

District	Transportation Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$445 134	3 709	\$120	75
Aiken	3 697 855	23,884	155	44
Allendale	613 150	1,822	337	3
Anderson 1	962 188	7 512	128	72
Anderson 2	524 174	3 589	146	58
Anderson 3	565 947	2,572	220	13
Anderson 4	482 643	2,679	180	28
Anderson 5	2,286,325	11 118	206	19
Bamberg 1	239 698	1 671	143	59
Bamberg 2	234 804	1,063	221	12
Barnwell 19	144 697	979	148	54
Barnwell 29	151 683	947	160	41
Barnwell 45	437 526	2,702	162	39
Beaufort	3 100 106	16,496	188	25
Berkeley	3 611 066	25,980	139	61
Calhoun	414 678	1 972	210	16
Charleston	6 387 703	41 829	153	48
Cherokee	1,224 000	8 822	139	62
Chester	950,216	6 367	149	51
Chesterfield	1 032,220	7 935	130	68
Clarendon 1	181 987	1,241	147	55
Clarendon 2	424 992	3,526	121	74
Clarendon 3	132,452	1 189	111	81
Coffeyton	1 307 550	6 638	197	22
Darlington	1 671 491	11 415	146	56
Dillon 1	188 772	901	210	17
Dillon 2	479,223	3 688	130	69
Dillon 3	193 055	1 486	130	70
Dorchester 2	2 651,289	16 666	159	42
Dorchester 4	692 074	2,422	288	4
Edgefield	587 424	3,926	150	50
Fairfield	1,269,081	3 625	350	1
Florence 1	1 901,282	13,614	140	60
Florence 2	204 138	1 082	189	23
Florence 3	717 433	4 124	174	32
Florence 4	180 852	1,072	169	37
Florence 5	152,588	1 438	106	82
Georgetown	1 711 907	9,859	174	33
Greenville	7,898 160	59,729	132	66
Greenwood 50	1 050,883	8 806	119	76
Greenwood 51	120 558	1 197	101	83
Greenwood 52	138 117	1 629	85	84
Hampton 1	466 722	2 604	179	29
Hampton 2	500 353	1,443	347	2

TABLE 112 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR TRANSPORTATION 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Transportation Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$7 101 133	28 455	\$250	9
Jasper	589 143	2,839	208	18
Kershaw	2 048 884	9 668	212	15
Lancaster	1 647 748	10 801	153	49
Laurens 55	987 405	5 781	172	34
Laurens 56	512 925	3 349	153	47
Lee	509,873	2 869	178	30
Lexington 1	3,913,529	17,268	227	11
Lexington 2	1 492,624	8 696	172	35
Lexington 3	415,930	2,284	184	27
Lexington 4	849,238	3 321	256	7
Lexington 5	2,270,851	14 755	154	48
McCormick	217 528	1 070	203	21
Marion 1	501 622	3 180	158	43
Marion 2	332 308	2 153	154	45
Marion 7	205 674	962	214	14
Marlboro	872,252	5 139	170	38
Newberry	1 018 069	5 761	177	31
Oconee	1 158,532	10 071	115	79
Orangeburg 3	1,034 740	3 660	283	5
Orangeburg 4	615 490	4 137	149	53
Orangeburg 5	879 911	7,298	121	73
Pickens	2 543 601	15,758	161	40
Richland 1	6 557 010	25 673	255	8
Richland 2	2 068,921	17 660	117	78
Saluda	428,123	2,087	204	20
Spartanburg 1	490 133	4 383	112	80
Spartanburg 2	1 080 999	8 080	134	65
Spartanburg 3	712 915	3 122	228	10
Spartanburg 4	337,801	2,852	118	77
Spartanburg 5	372 990	5 765	65	57
Spartanburg 6	709 663	9 102	78	85
Spartanburg 7	2,178 870	8 510	258	6
Sumter 2	1,695 453	9 170	185	28
Sumter 17	848 578	8 689	74	88
Union	738,987	4 987	149	52
Williamsburg	998 672	6 114	163	38
York 1	934 429	4 968	188	24
York 2	635 313	4 600	138	63
York 3	2 019,541	14 978	135	64
York 4	707 804	5 508	129	71
State Total	\$107,387,290	652,435	\$165	
District Median			\$158	

TABLE 112 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR TRANSPORTATION, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Transportation Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Fairfield	\$1,269,061	3,625	\$350	1
Hampton 2	500,353	1,443	347	2
Allendale	613,150	1,822	337	3
Dorchester 4	692,074	2,422	286	4
Orangeburg 3	1,034,740	3,660	283	5
Spartanburg 7	2,178,870	8,510	256	6
Lexington 4	849,236	3,321	256	7
Richland 1	6,557,010	25,673	255	8
Horry	7,101,133	28,455	250	9
Spartanburg 3	712,915	3,122	228	10
Lexington 1	3,913,529	17,268	227	11
Bamberg 2	234,804	1,063	221	12
Anderson 3	565,947	2,572	220	13
Manon 7	205,674	962	214	14
Kershaw	2,048,884	9,666	212	15
Calhoun	414,678	1,972	210	16
Dillon 1	188,772	901	210	17
Jasper	589,143	2,839	208	18
Anderson 5	2,288,325	11,118	206	19
Saluda	428,123	2,087	204	20
McCormick	217,526	1,070	203	21
Coleton	1,307,550	6,638	197	22
Florence 2	204,138	1,062	189	23
York 1	934,429	4,968	188	24
Beaufort	3,100,106	16,496	188	25
Sumter 2	1,695,453	9,170	185	26
Lexington 3	415,930	2,264	184	27
Anderson 4	482,643	2,679	180	28
Hampton 1	466,722	2,604	179	29
Lee	509,873	2,869	178	30
Newberry	1,018,069	5,751	177	31
Florence 3	717,433	4,124	174	32
Georgetown	1,711,907	9,859	174	33
Laurens 55	997,405	5,791	172	34
Lexington 2	1,492,624	8,696	172	35
Marlboro	872,252	5,139	170	36
Florence 4	180,852	1,072	169	37
Williamsburg	998,672	6,114	163	38
Bamwell 45	437,526	2,702	162	39
Pickens	2,543,601	15,758	161	40
Bamwell 29	151,683	947	160	41
Dorchester 2	2,651,289	16,666	159	42
Marion 1	501,622	3,180	158	43
Aiken	3,697,855	23,884	155	44

TABLE 112 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR TRANSPORTATION 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Transportation Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Marion 2	\$332,308	2,153	\$154	45
Lexington 5	2,270,651	14,755	154	46
Laurens 58	512,925	3,349	153	47
Charleston	6,387,703	41,829	153	48
Lancaster	1,647,748	10,801	153	49
Edgefield	587,424	3,926	150	50
Chester	950,216	6,367	149	51
Union	738,967	4,967	149	52
Orangeburg 4	615,490	4,137	149	53
Barnwell 19	144,697	979	148	54
Clarendon 1	181,987	1,241	147	55
Darlington	1,671,491	11,415	146	56
Anderson 2	524,174	3,589	146	58
Bamberg 1	239,698	1,671	143	59
Florence 1	1,901,292	13,614	140	60
Berkeley	3,611,066	25,980	139	61
Cherokee	1,224,000	8,622	139	62
York 2	635,313	4,600	138	63
York 3	2,019,541	14,876	135	64
Spartanburg 2	1,080,999	8,080	134	65
Greenville	7,898,160	59,729	132	66
Chesterfield	1,032,220	7,935	130	68
Dillon 2	479,223	3,688	130	69
Dillon 3	193,055	1,486	130	70
York 4	707,804	5,508	129	71
Anderson 1	962,188	7,512	128	72
Orangeburg 5	879,911	7,298	121	73
Clarendon 2	424,992	3,526	121	74
Abbeville	445,134	3,709	120	75
Greenwood 50	1,050,983	8,806	119	76
Spartanburg 4	337,801	2,852	118	77
Richland 2	2,068,921	17,660	117	78
Oconee	1,158,532	10,071	115	79
Spartanburg 1	490,133	4,383	112	80
Clarendon 3	132,452	1,189	111	81
Florence 5	152,588	1,438	106	82
Greenwood 51	120,558	1,197	101	83
Greenwood 52	138,117	1,629	85	84
Spartanburg 6	709,663	9,102	78	85
Sumter 17	848,578	8,689	74	86
Spartanburg 5	372,990	5,755	65	57
State Total	\$107,367,290	652,435	\$165	
District Median			\$158	

See "References for Tables"

**TABLE 113
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SAFETY 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically

District	Safety Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$109,356	3,709	\$29	27
Aiken	627,352	23,884	26	34
Allendale	55,707	1,822	31	24
Anderson 1	150,416	7,512	20	56
Anderson 2	57,996	3,589	16	70
Anderson 3	21,871	2,572	8	83
Anderson 4	61,550	2,679	23	49
Anderson 5	733,212	11,118	66	4
Barnberg 1	54,889	1,671	33	22
Barnberg 2	30,270	1,063	28	29
Barnwell 19	43,674	979	45	11
Barnwell 29	81,870	947	86	1
Barnwell 45	68,947	2,702	26	38
Beaufort	408,646	16,496	25	41
Berkley	505,761	25,980	19	59
Calhoun	37,651	1,972	19	62
Charleston	659,382	41,829	16	74
Cherokee	154,704	8,822	18	65
Chester	221,592	6,367	35	20
Chesterfield	203,049	7,935	26	37
Clarendon 1	34,485	1,241	28	32
Clarendon 2	82,428	3,526	23	46
Clarendon 3	26,111	1,189	22	53
Colleton	161,808	6,638	24	42
Darlington	278,244	11,415	24	43
Dillon 1	34,200	901	38	16
Dillon 2	91,620	3,688	25	40
Dillon 3	34,500	1,486	23	48
Dorchester 2	404,960	16,666	24	44
Dorchester 4	51,564	2,422	21	64
Edgefield	119,642	3,926	30	25
Fairfield	197,678	3,625	55	6
Florence 1	288,822	13,614	21	55
Florence 2	39,000	1,082	36	18
Florence 3	116,248	4,124	28	31
Florence 4	54,003	1,072	50	7
Florence 5	53,373	1,438	37	17
Georgetown	425,395	9,859	43	12
Greenville	1,168,554	59,729	20	58
Greenwood 50	108,905	8,806	12	79
Greenwood 51	30,949	1,197	26	35
Greenwood 52	41,846	1,629	26	36
Hampton 1	60,511	2,604	23	47
Hampton 2	67,589	1,443	47	9

TABLE 113 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SAFETY 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Safety Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$942,470	28,455	\$33	21
Jasper	38,259	2,839	14	77
Kershaw	18,528	9,688	2	86
Lancaster	259,505	10,801	24	45
Laurens 55	51,738	5,791	9	82
Laurens 56	27,132	3,349	8	84
Lee	54,237	2,889	19	63
Lexington 1	272,388	17,268	16	73
Lexington 2	260,894	8,698	30	28
Lexington 3	60,784	2,264	22	60
Lexington 4	58,212	3,321	18	64
Lexington 5	325,944	14,755	22	52
McCormick	10,081	1,070	9	81
Marion 1	50,788	3,180	16	71
Marion 2	48,103	2,153	22	51
Marion 7	40,340	962	42	13
Marlboro	81,754	5,139	16	72
Newberry	182,947	5,751	32	23
Oconee	396,421	10,071	39	15
Orangeburg 3	93,147	3,660	26	39
Orangeburg 4	189,367	4,137	46	10
Orangeburg 5	508,885	7,298	70	3
Pickens	288,171	15,758	17	68
Richland 1	1,811,163	25,673	71	2
Richland 2	1,001,683	17,660	57	5
Saluda	60,017	2,087	29	28
Spartanburg 1	69,000	4,383	16	75
Spartanburg 2	216,702	8,080	27	33
Spartanburg 3	108,898	3,122	35	19
Spartanburg 4	55,000	2,852	19	61
Spartanburg 5	279,989	5,755	49	8
Spartanburg 6	148,870	9,102	18	69
Spartanburg 7	347,703	8,510	41	14
Sumter 2	129,297	9,170	14	78
Sumter 17	85,304	8,689	10	80
Union	140,079	4,967	28	30
Williamsburg	103,500	8,114	17	66
York 1	67,983	4,968	14	78
York 2	34,500	4,600	8	85
York 3	291,367	14,976	19	60
York 4	108,820	5,508	20	57
State Total	\$17,551,244	652,435	\$27	
District Median			\$24	

TABLE 113 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SAFETY 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Safety Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Barnwell 29	\$81 870	947	\$86	1
Richland 1	1 811 163	25 673	71	2
Orangeburg 5	508,985	7,298	70	3
Anderson 5	733,212	11 118	66	4
Richland 2	1,001 663	17 660	57	5
Fairfield	197 678	3 625	55	6
Florence 4	54 003	1 072	50	7
Spartanburg 5	279 969	5 755	49	8
Hampton 2	67 589	1 443	47	9
Orangeburg 4	189,387	4 137	46	10
Barnwell 19	43 674	979	45	11
Georgetown	425,396	9 859	43	12
Marion 7	40 340	962	42	13
Spartanburg 7	347 703	8 510	41	14
Oconee	396 421	10 071	39	15
Dillon 1	34,200	901	38	16
Florence 5	53,373	1 438	37	17
Florence 2	39 000	1 082	36	18
Spartanburg 3	108,898	3 122	35	19
Chester	221,582	6,387	35	20
Horry	942 470	28,455	33	21
Bamberg 1	54,889	1,871	33	22
Newberry	182,947	5 751	32	23
Allendale	55 707	1 822	31	24
Edgefield	119 642	3,828	30	25
Lexington 2	260 894	8 696	30	26
Abbeville	109 356	3 709	29	27
Saluda	60 017	2 087	29	28
Bamberg 2	30,270	1,083	28	29
Union	140 079	4,967	28	30
Florence 3	116,248	4 124	28	31
Clarendon 1	34 485	1,241	28	32
Spartanburg 2	216 702	8 080	27	33
Alken	827 352	23 884	26	34
Greenwood 51	30 949	1 197	26	35
Greenwood 52	41 848	1 829	26	36
Chesterfield	203,049	7,935	26	37
Barnwell 45	68,947	2 702	26	38
Orangeburg 3	93 147	3 660	25	39
Dillon 2	91,620	3 688	25	40
Beaufort	408 648	16 496	25	41
Colleton	161,808	6 838	24	42
Darlington	278,244	11 415	24	43
Dorchester 2	404,960	16 668	24	44

TABLE 113 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR SAFETY 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Safety Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Lancaster	\$259,505	10,801	\$24	45
Clarendon 2	82,428	3,526	23	46
Hampton 1	60,511	2,604	23	47
Dillon 3	34,500	1,488	23	48
Anderson 4	61,550	2,679	23	49
Lexington 3	50,784	2,284	22	50
Marion 2	48,103	2,163	22	51
Lexington 5	325,944	14,755	22	52
Clarendon 3	28,111	1,189	22	53
Dorchester 4	51,554	2,422	21	54
Florence 1	288,822	13,614	21	55
Anderson 1	150,416	7,512	20	56
York 4	109,920	5,506	20	57
Greenville	1,168,554	59,729	20	58
Berkeley	505,761	25,980	19	59
York 3	291,367	14,978	19	60
Spartanburg 4	55,000	2,852	19	61
Calhoun	37,651	1,972	19	62
Lee	54,237	2,889	19	63
Lexington 4	59,212	3,321	18	64
Cherokee	154,704	8,822	18	65
Williamsburg	103,500	6,114	17	66
Pickens	266,171	15,758	17	68
Spartanburg 6	148,870	9,102	16	69
Anderson 2	57,996	3,589	16	70
Marion 1	50,786	3,180	16	71
Marlboro	81,754	5,139	16	72
Lexington 1	272,366	17,268	16	73
Charleston	659,382	41,829	16	74
Spartanburg 1	68,000	4,383	16	75
Sumter 2	129,297	9,170	14	76
Jasper	39,259	2,839	14	77
York 1	67,983	4,968	14	78
Greenwood 50	108,905	8,806	12	79
Sumter 17	85,304	8,689	10	80
McCormick	10,061	1,070	9	81
Laurens 55	51,738	5,791	9	82
Anderson 3	21,871	2,572	8	83
Laurens 56	27,132	3,349	8	84
York 2	34,500	4,600	8	85
Kershaw	18,528	9,666	2	86
State Total	\$17,551,244	652,435	\$27	
District Median			\$24	

*See "References for Tables"

**TABLE 114
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR BUSINESS SERVICES 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Business Services 2001-02 ADM Expenditures	(K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$719 920	3 709	\$194	37
Aiken	3,205,131	23,884	134	72
Allendale	595 003	1,822	327	6
Anderson 1	958 960	7 512	128	70
Anderson 2	499 926	3,589	139	64
Anderson 3	444 901	2 572	173	39
Anderson 4	958 428	2 679	358	9
Anderson 5	2 408 592	11 118	217	26
Bamberg 1	324,974	1 671	194	44
Bamberg 2	447 472	1 063	421	5
Barnwell 19	131,880	979	135	77
Barnwell 29	169 741	947	179	38
Barnwell 45	267 792	2,702	99	76
Beaufort	2,859 645	16 496	173	46
Berkeley	3,869 092	25 980	149	62
Calhoun	467 141	1 972	237	28
Charleston	5 645 620	41,829	135	68
Cherokee	2 476 448	8,822	261	7
Chester	1 678 150	6,367	264	13
Chesterfield	1 099 684	7 935	139	69
Clarendon 1	281,349	1,241	227	43
Clarendon 2	640 759	3,526	162	60
Clarendon 3	202,617	1 169	170	49
Coffeyton	692 083	6,638	104	74
Darlington	1 931 542	11 415	189	10
Dillon 1	86 014	901	95	80
Dillon 2	1 173 394	3 688	318	11
Dillon 3	168 888	1 466	127	63
Dorchester 2	2 352,715	16,666	141	57
Dorchester 4	622,788	2,422	257	19
Edgefield	714,083	3 826	182	54
Fairfield	1 828 163	3 625	504	1
Florence 1	1 336 443	13 614	98	75
Florence 2	19,214	1,082	18	85
Florence 3	658,062	4 124	206	22
Florence 4	200,934	1,072	167	58
Florence 5	105,391	1 438	73	73
Georgetown	2,940 113	9,859	298	8
Greenville	10 412 003	59 729	174	42
Greenwood 50	1 167 089	8,806	133	65
Greenwood 51	216 985	1 197	161	27
Greenwood 52	91 594	1 629	56	84
Hampton 1	0	2,804	0	66
Hampton 2	386 649	1 443	268	25

TABLE 114 (Continued)
 CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
 FOR BUSINESS SERVICES 2001-02*
 BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Business Services Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$6 687 311	28 455	\$234	22
Jasper	572,300	2 839	202	33
Kershaw	1 652 011	9 668	171	49
Lancaster	1 813 028	10 801	168	53
Laurens 55	977 952	5 791	169	52
Laurens 56	658 162	3 349	197	34
Lee	513 873	2 869	179	45
Lexington 1	3,571,237	17,268	207	28
Lexington 2	2,506 905	8 696	288	12
Lexington 3	368 012	2,264	163	55
Lexington 4	678 772	3,321	204	30
Lexington 5	3 363,809	14 755	228	23
McCormick	218,276	1,070	202	32
Marion 1	425 310	3 180	134	70
Marion 2	358 688	2 153	167	54
Marion 7	243,357	962	253	20
Marlboro	959 612	5 139	187	40
Newberry	1 185,382	5 751	208	29
Oconee	2,753,988	10,071	273	15
Orangeburg 3	1 350 517	3,660	369	6
Orangeburg 4	788 022	4 137	190	38
Orangeburg 5	1 522,081	7,298	209	28
Pickens	3 021 154	15,758	192	37
Richland 1	7 031 622	25,873	274	14
Richland 2	6,227 918	17 660	353	8
Saluda	558,190	2 087	267	17
Spartanburg 1	444,247	4,383	101	77
Spartanburg 2	1 073,342	8 080	133	71
Spartanburg 3	1,269,010	3,122	406	5
Spartanburg 4	413,315	2,852	145	61
Spartanburg 5	398,903	5,755	69	83
Spartanburg 6	1,852,885	9 102	204	31
Spartanburg 7	1,307 582	8,510	154	59
Sumter 2	962 340	9,170	105	75
Sumter 17	1,208 594	8 688	139	64
Union	475 598	4 967	98	80
Williamsburg	965 748	8,114	158	58
York 1	323 517	4,988	65	84
York 2	736 855	4 600	160	56
York 3	2,372 181	14,978	158	57
York 4	2 438 412	5,506	443	2
State Total	\$123,901,378	652,435	\$190	
District Median			\$179	

TABLE 114 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR BUSINESS SERVICES 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Business Services 2000-01 ADM Expenditures	(K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Fairfield	\$1 828 163	3 625	\$504	1
York 4	2 438 412	5 508	443	2
Bamberg 2	447 472	1 063	421	4
Spartanburg 3	1,269 010	3 122	406	5
Orangeburg 3	1 350 517	3 660	369	6
Anderson 4	958 428	2 679	358	7
Richland 2	6,227 918	17 660	353	8
Alendale	595 003	1 822	327	9
Dillon 2	1 173 394	3 688	318	10
Georgetown	2,940 113	9,859	298	11
Lexington 2	2 506,905	8 698	288	12
Cherokee	2 478,448	8 822	281	13
Richland 1	7 031 622	25 873	274	14
Oconee	2 753 888	10 071	273	15
Hampton 2	388 649	1 443	268	16
Saluda	558 180	2 087	267	17
Chester	1 678,150	6 367	264	18
Dorchester 4	622,788	2 422	257	19
Manon 7	243,357	962	253	20
Cathoun	467 141	1 972	237	21
Horry	6 687 311	28 455	234	22
Lexington 5	3 363 809	14 755	228	23
Clarendon 1	281 349	1,241	227	24
Anderson 5	2 408 592	11 118	217	25
Orangeburg 5	1 522,061	7,298	209	26
Florence 3	858 062	4 124	208	27
Lexington 1	3 571,237	17,268	207	28
Newberry	1 185,392	5 751	206	29
Lexington 4	878 772	3,321	204	30
Spartanburg 6	1,852 885	9 102	204	31
McCormick	218,278	1 070	202	32
Jasper	572 300	2,839	202	33
Laurens 56	658 162	3 349	197	34
Bamberg 1	324,974	1 671	194	35
Abbeville	719,920	3 709	194	36
Pickens	3 021 154	15,758	192	37
Orangeburg 4	788 022	4 137	190	38
Florence 4	200 834	1 072	187	39
Marlboro	959 612	5 139	187	40
Edgefield	714 083	3 926	182	41
Clarendon 2	640 759	3 526	182	42
Greenwood 51	218 985	1 197	181	43
Barnwell 29	169 741	947	179	44
Lee	513 873	2 869	179	45

TABLE 114 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR BUSINESS SERVICES 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Business Services 2001-02 ADM Expenditures	(K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Greenville	10 412 003	59,729	174	46
Beaufort	2 859 645	16 496	173	47
Anderson 3	444 901	2,572	173	48
Kershaw	1 652 011	9 866	171	49
Clarendon 3	202 617	1 189	170	50
Darlington	1 931 542	11 415	169	51
Laurens 55	977 952	5,791	169	52
Lancaster	1 813 028	10 801	168	53
Marion 2	358 686	2,153	167	54
Lexington 3	368 012	2,264	163	56
York 2	738 855	4 600	160	58
York 3	2 372 181	14,976	158	57
Williamsburg	965 748	6 114	158	58
Spartanburg 7	1 307 582	8 510	154	59
Berkeley	3,869 092	25 980	149	60
Spartanburg 4	413 315	2 852	145	61
Dorchester 2	2 352 715	18 666	141	62
Anderson 2	499,926	3 589	139	63
Sumter 17	1,208 594	8,889	139	64
Chesterfield	1 099 684	7,935	139	65
Charleston	5 645 620	41,829	135	66
Barnwell 19	131 880	979	135	68
Aiken	3,205 131	23,884	134	69
Manon 1	425,310	3 180	134	70
Spartanburg 2	1 073,342	8 080	133	71
Greenwood 50	1 187 089	8,806	133	72
Anderson 1	958,960	7,512	128	73
Dillon 3	188,888	1 486	127	74
Sumter 2	982,340	9 170	105	75
Colleton	692,083	6 638	104	76
Spartanburg 1	444,247	4,383	101	77
Barnwell 45	267 792	2,702	99	78
Florence 1	1,336 443	13 614	98	79
Union	475,598	4 967	96	80
Dillon 1	86,014	901	95	81
Florence 5	105,391	1 438	73	82
Spartanburg 5	398,903	5 755	69	83
York 1	323 517	4,968	65	84
Greenwood 52	91,594	1 629	56	85
Florence 2	19,214	1 082	18	86
Hampton 1	0	2 604	0	3
State Total	\$123,901,376	652,435	\$190	
District Median			\$179	

*See "References for Tables."

**TABLE 115
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically

District	Capital Projects Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$7 855 105	3 709	\$2 118	12
Aiken	34 995 566	23 884	1 465	23
Allendale	87 759	1 822	48	86
Anderson 1	9 333,203	7 512	1,242	27
Anderson 2	22 967 647	3 589	6 399	1
Anderson 3	10 363,269	2,572	4 029	2
Anderson 4	4,254 527	2,679	1 598	20
Anderson 5	9 313 848	11 118	838	38
Barnberg 1	373 133	1 671	223	72
Barnberg 2	242 529	1 063	228	71
Barnwell 19	853 668	979	872	35
Barnwell 29	869 420	947	918	34
Barnwell 45	476,241	2 702	176	77
Beaufort	25 981 569	16 498	1 574	21
Berkeley	75 088 333	25 980	2,890	6
Calhoun	1 436 727	1,972	729	43
Charleston	84 502 965	41,829	2 020	13
Cherokee	2,774 182	8,822	314	68
Chester	698 998	6,367	110	81
Chesterfield	22,843 574	7,935	2 879	7
Clarendon 1	1 182 966	1,241	953	33
Clarendon 2	2,088 793	3 528	592	53
Clarendon 3	2,050 939	1 189	1 725	18
Colleton	9,648 511	8 638	1 454	24
Darlington	7 171 399	11 415	628	50
Dillon 1	396 115	901	440	69
Dillon 2	1 460 020	3,688	396	62
Dillon 3	1,077 071	1 486	725	44
Dorchester 2	10 159 056	16,666	610	52
Dorchester 4	1,230,333	2,422	508	55
Edgefield	3,340 950	3,828	851	36
Fairfield	292,179	3,625	81	83
Florence 1	9 080 785	13,614	666	47
Florence 2	1 095 436	1 082	1 012	32
Florence 3	651 992	4 124	158	78
Florence 4	234,817	1 072	219	73
Florence 5	1 102 717	1,438	787	41
Georgetown	17,257 683	9,859	1 750	17
Greenville	98,398 476	59 729	1 614	19
Greenwood 50	3 052,560	8,806	347	65
Greenwood 51	92,801	1 197	78	84
Greenwood 52	4 598,242	1 629	2 823	8
Hampton 1	808 033	2 604	310	66
Hampton 2	285 767	1 443	198	76

**TABLE 115 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT**

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Capital Projects Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$68,584,344	28,465	\$2,338	10
Jasper	353,090	2,839	124	79
Kershaw	27,050,963	9,666	2,799	9
Lancaster	23,971,290	10,801	2,219	11
Laurens 55	11,062,991	5,791	1,910	14
Laurens 56	1,096,827	3,349	328	67
Lee	582,998	2,869	203	75
Lexington 1	1,401,975	17,268	81	82
Lexington 2	12,851,325	8,696	1,478	22
Lexington 3	1,587,219	2,264	701	45
Lexington 4	3,772,599	3,321	1,138	30
Lexington 5	19,062,325	14,755	1,293	25
McCormick	63,978	1,070	60	85
Marion 1	776,962	3,180	244	70
Marion 2	856,199	2,153	398	61
Marion 7	1,237,096	962	1,288	26
Marlboro	2,637,388	5,139	513	54
Newberry	2,715,516	5,751	472	57
Oconee	6,435,650	10,071	639	48
Orangeburg 3	1,212,983	3,660	331	66
Orangeburg 4	2,555,419	4,137	618	51
Orangeburg 5	22,134,808	7,298	3,033	4
Pickens	6,678,869	15,758	424	60
Richland 1	31,355,244	25,673	1,221	28
Richland 2	17,917,495	17,660	1,015	31
Saluda	3,713,578	2,087	1,779	18
Spartanburg 1	3,698,843	4,383	843	37
Spartanburg 2	3,566,753	8,080	441	58
Spartanburg 3	1,994,181	3,122	639	49
Spartanburg 4	1,008,806	2,852	354	64
Spartanburg 5	4,411,459	5,755	767	42
Spartanburg 6	35,343,478	9,102	3,883	3
Spartanburg 7	15,300,401	8,510	1,798	15
Sumter 2	7,114,130	9,170	776	40
Sumter 17	3,343,360	8,689	385	63
Union	2,392,668	4,967	482	56
Williamsburg	673,429	6,114	110	80
York 1	3,325,641	4,968	669	46
York 2	3,643,840	4,600	792	39
York 3	17,867,482	14,978	1,193	29
York 4	16,262,920	5,508	2,954	5
State Total	\$879,640,823	652,435	\$1,348	
District Median			\$729	

TABLE 115 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Capital Projects Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Anderson 2	\$22,967,847	3,589	\$6,398	1
Anderson 3	10,363,289	2,572	4,029	2
Spartanburg 6	35,343,478	9,102	3,883	3
Orangeburg 5	22,134,808	7,298	3,033	4
York 4	18,262,820	5,506	2,954	5
Berkeley	75,088,333	25,980	2,890	6
Chesterfield	22,843,574	7,935	2,879	7
Greenwood 52	4,598,242	1,629	2,823	8
Kershaw	27,060,963	9,666	2,799	9
Horry	68,664,344	28,455	2,339	10
Lancaster	23,871,290	10,801	2,219	11
Abbeville	7,855,105	3,709	2,118	12
Charleston	84,502,965	41,829	2,020	13
Laurens 55	11,062,981	5,791	1,910	14
Spartanburg 7	15,300,401	8,510	1,798	15
Saluda	3,713,578	2,087	1,779	16
Georgetown	17,257,683	9,859	1,750	17
Clarendon 3	2,050,938	1,189	1,725	18
Greenville	98,398,478	59,729	1,614	19
Anderson 4	4,254,527	2,679	1,588	20
Beaufort	25,961,569	16,496	1,574	21
Lexington 2	12,851,325	8,698	1,478	22
Aiken	34,895,568	23,884	1,465	23
Colleton	9,848,511	6,638	1,454	24
Lexington 5	19,082,325	14,755	1,283	25
Marion 7	1,237,096	962	1,268	26
Anderson 1	9,333,203	7,512	1,242	27
Richland 1	31,355,244	25,673	1,221	28
York 3	17,887,482	14,978	1,183	29
Lexington 4	3,772,689	3,321	1,138	30
Richland 2	17,917,495	17,660	1,015	31
Florence 2	1,095,436	1,082	1,012	32
Clarendon 1	1,182,968	1,241	953	33
Bamwell 29	869,420	947	918	34
Bamwell 19	853,668	979	872	35
Edgefield	3,340,950	3,926	851	36
Spartanburg 1	3,698,843	4,383	843	37
Anderson 5	9,313,848	11,118	838	38
York 2	3,643,840	4,600	782	39
Sumter 2	7,114,130	9,170	778	40
Florence 5	1,102,717	1,438	767	41
Spartanburg 5	4,411,459	5,755	767	42
Calhoun	1,438,727	1,972	729	43
Dillon 3	1,077,071	1,486	725	44

TABLE 115 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Capital Projects Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Lexington 3	\$1 587,219	2,264	\$701	45
York 1	3,325,841	4,968	669	46
Florence 1	9 080 785	13,814	666	47
Oconee	6 435,659	10,071	639	48
Spartanburg 3	1 994 151	3,122	639	49
Darlington	7 171,399	11 415	628	50
Orangeburg 4	2,555,419	4 137	618	51
Dorchester 2	10 159 056	16 666	610	52
Clarendon 2	2,086 783	3 526	592	53
Marlboro	2,637,388	6,139	513	54
Dorchester 4	1,230,333	2,422	508	55
Union	2,392,668	4,967	482	56
Newberry	2,715,516	5 751	472	57
Spartanburg 2	3,568 753	8 080	441	58
Dillon 1	396 115	901	440	59
Pickens	6,678,869	15,758	424	60
Marion 2	858,199	2,153	398	61
Dillon 2	1 460,020	3,688	396	62
Sumter 17	3,343,380	8,689	385	63
Spartanburg 4	1 008,606	2,852	354	64
Greenwood 50	3 052,560	8,806	347	65
Orangeburg 3	1,212,983	3,660	331	66
Laurens 56	1 096,827	3,349	328	67
Cherokee	2 774 182	8,822	314	68
Hampton 1	806,033	2,604	310	69
Macon 1	776,982	3 180	244	70
Bamberg 2	242,629	1,063	228	71
Bamberg 1	373,133	1,871	223	72
Florence 4	234,817	1 072	219	73
Lee	582,996	2,869	203	75
Hampton 2	285,767	1,443	198	76
Barnwell 45	476,241	2,702	176	77
Florence 3	651,992	4 124	158	78
Jasper	353,090	2,839	124	79
Williamsburg	673,429	6,114	110	80
Chester	696,896	6,367	110	81
Lexington 1	1 401,975	17,268	81	82
Fairfield	292,179	3 625	81	83
Greenwood 51	92,801	1 197	76	84
McCormick	63,978	1 070	60	85
Allendale	87 759	1,822	48	86
State Total	\$879,640,023	652,435	\$1,348	
<i>District Median</i>			\$729	

*See "References for Tables."

TABLE 116
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Debt Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Abbeville	\$1 910,824	3 709	\$515	39
Aiken	11,264 727	23 884	472	44
Allendale	375,970	1,822	206	71
Anderson 1	3 110 608	7,512	414	51
Anderson 2	2 838,258	3 589	818	21
Anderson 3	1 014 188	2 572	394	55
Anderson 4	2 739,206	2,679	1 022	17
Anderson 5	8 169,633	11 118	735	25
Bamberg 1	4,275 752	1,671	2 559	5
Bamberg 2	549 720	1,063	517	36
Barnwell 19	570 812	979	583	34
Barnwell 29	300 707	947	318	63
Barnwell 45	1 174,374	2 702	435	49
Beaufort	18 434 461	16 496	1 178	12
Berkeley	17 428,568	25,980	671	29
Calhoun	926,983	1,972	470	46
Charleston	35 018 009	41,829	837	20
Cherokee	7 006 105	8,822	794	22
Chester	4 541,951	6,367	713	27
Chesterfield	2 408,545	7,935	304	64
Clarendon 1	1,281,058	1,241	1 032	14
Clarendon 2	771,332	3 526	219	69
Clarendon 3	477,669	1 189	402	54
Colleton	1 358 536	6 638	205	72
Darlington	2 940,939	11,415	258	67
Dillon 1	25 455	901	28	84
Dillon 2	0	3 688	0	85
Dillon 3	0	1,486	0	86
Dorchester 2	7 180,006	16,666	431	50
Dorchester 4	1 617,294	2,422	668	30
Edgefield	1 770,393	3,926	451	47
Fairfield	2,027,334	3,625	559	35
Florence 1	5 178,396	13,614	380	59
Florence 2	684 768	1,082	633	32
Florence 3	1 053 425	4 124	256	68
Florence 4	1,216,186	1 072	1 135	13
Florence 5	512,205	1 438	356	60
Georgetown	7,456,156	9,859	756	23
Greenville	163,003,600	59 729	2,729	4
Greenwood 50	2,574 670	8,606	292	65
Greenwood 51	116,250	1 197	97	81
Greenwood 52	666,079	1 629	409	52
Hampton 1	545,240	2,604	209	70
Hampton 2	279 566	1 443	194	74

TABLE 116 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Listed Alphabetically				
District	Debt Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Horry	\$23,850,845	28 455	\$838	19
Jasper	1,244,871	2,839	439	48
Kershaw	4,881,324	9,668	505	41
Lancaster	8,871 715	10 801	638	31
Laurens 55	2,354,601	5 791	407	53
Laurens 56	1 120 407	3,349	335	62
Lee	1 457,261	2,869	508	40
Lexington 1	87,509 788	17,268	5,088	2
Lexington 2	12,370,810	8 698	1,423	8
Lexington 3	1,867 496	2,264	737	24
Lexington 4	2,432,620	3,321	732	26
Lexington 5	15,225,913	14 755	1 032	15
McCormick	90,952	1 070	85	82
Marion 1	499 892	3 180	157	76
Marion 2	249 053	2 153	116	79
Marion 7	151,283	862	167	75
Marlboro	1,982,015	5,139	386	57
Newberry	225 428	5,751	39	83
Oconee	5,483 409	10,071	544	36
Orangeburg 3	1,258,487	3,680	344	61
Orangeburg 4	3,965,062	4 137	958	18
Orangeburg 5	3,527 062	7,298	483	42
Pickens	6,024 145	15,758	382	58
Richland 1	81,584 602	25,873	3 178	3
Richland 2	21 669,917	17,860	1,227	10
Saluda	1 444,012	2,087	692	28
Spartanburg 1	2,085,405	4,383	476	43
Spartanburg 2	2,314 605	6,080	286	66
Spartanburg 3	1,924,891	3 122	617	33
Spartanburg 4	564,921	2,852	198	73
Spartanburg 5	5,933,630	5 756	1 031	16
Spartanburg 6	1,045,414	9 102	115	80
Spartanburg 7	122,879,844	8,510	14 416	1
Sumter 2	10,811 141	9 170	1 179	11
Sumter 17	4 691,885	8,689	540	37
Union	663,886	4,967	134	78
Williamsburg	873,713	6,114	143	77
York 1	2,338,699	4,968	471	45
York 2	7,521 182	4 600	1 635	7
York 3	38,070,408	14 878	2 542	6
York 4	7 747,624	5,506	1,407	9
State Total	\$826,323,777	652,435	\$1,267	
District Median			\$476	

TABLE 116 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Debt Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
Spartanburg 7	\$122 879 844	8,510	\$14 418	1
Lexington 1	87 509 788	17,268	5 068	2
Richland 1	81 584 602	25,673	3 178	3
Greenville	163 003 800	59 729	2 729	4
Bamberg 1	4,275 752	1,871	2,559	5
York 3	38 070 408	14,976	2 542	6
York 2	7 521 162	4,600	1 635	7
Lexington 2	12 370 610	8,696	1 423	8
York 4	7 747 624	5,506	1 407	9
Richland 2	21 669,917	17,660	1,227	10
Sumter 2	10 811 141	9 170	1 179	11
Beaufort	19 434 481	16,496	1 178	12
Florence 4	1,216 186	1 072	1 135	13
Clarendon 1	1 281 058	1,241	1 032	14
Lexington 5	15,225,913	14 755	1 032	15
Spartanburg 5	5,933 830	5,755	1 031	16
Anderson 4	2,739,206	2,679	1 022	17
Orangeburg 4	3 965 082	4 137	958	18
Horry	23 850 945	28,455	838	19
Charleston	35 018 009	41 829	837	20
Anderson 2	2,936,258	3,589	818	21
Cherokee	7 008 105	8,822	794	22
Georgetown	7 455,156	9,859	758	23
Lexington 3	1,867 495	2,284	737	24
Anderson 5	8 169 633	11 118	735	25
Lexington 4	2 432,620	3,321	732	26
Chester	4 541 951	6,367	713	27
Saluda	1 444 012	2,087	692	28
Berkeley	17 428,568	25,980	671	29
Dorchester 4	1 617,294	2,422	669	30
Lancaster	6,871 715	10,801	636	31
Florence 2	684 768	1,082	633	32
Spartanburg 3	1,924,891	3,122	617	33
Barnwell 19	570 812	979	583	34
Fairfield	2,027,334	3,625	559	35
Oconee	5 483 409	10 071	544	36
Sumter 17	4 691 885	8,689	540	37
Bamberg 2	549 720	1 063	517	38
Abbeville	1,910,824	3 709	515	39
Lee	1 457,261	2,869	508	40
Kershaw	4,881 324	9 666	505	41
Orangeburg 5	3 627 062	7,298	483	42
Spartanburg 1	2 085 405	4,383	476	43
Aiken	11,264 727	23,684	472	44

TABLE 116 (Continued)
CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL
FOR DEBT SERVICE, 2001-02*
BY DISTRICT

Ranked Numerically				
District	Debt Service Expenditures	2001-02 ADM (K-12)	Per Pupil Expenditures	Rank
York 1	\$2,338,899	4,968	\$471	45
Calhoun	826,883	1,972	470	46
Edgefield	1,770,393	3,826	451	47
Jasper	1,244,971	2,839	439	48
Barnwell 45	1,174,374	2,702	435	49
Dorchester 2	7,180,006	16,666	431	50
Anderson 1	3,110,608	7,312	414	51
Greenwood 52	666,079	1,629	409	52
Laurens 55	2,354,601	5,791	407	53
Clarendon 3	477,669	1,189	402	54
Anderson 3	1,014,168	2,572	394	55
Marlboro	1,982,015	5,139	388	57
Pickens	6,024,145	15,759	382	58
Florence 1	5,178,388	13,614	380	59
Florence 5	512,205	1,438	356	60
Orangeburg 3	1,258,487	3,660	344	61
Laurens 58	1,120,407	3,349	335	62
Barnwell 29	300,707	947	318	63
Chesterfield	2,408,545	7,835	304	64
Greenwood 50	2,574,670	8,806	292	65
Spartanburg 2	2,314,605	8,080	288	66
Darlington	2,840,939	11,415	258	67
Florence 3	1,053,426	4,124	255	68
Clarendon 2	771,332	3,526	219	69
Hampton 1	545,240	2,604	209	70
Allendale	375,970	1,822	206	71
Colleton	1,358,538	6,638	205	72
Spartanburg 4	584,821	2,852	198	73
Hampton 2	279,588	1,443	194	74
Marion 7	151,283	962	157	75
Marion 1	499,892	3,180	157	76
Williamsburg	873,713	6,114	143	77
Union	663,866	4,967	134	78
Marion 2	249,053	2,153	118	79
Spartanburg 6	1,045,414	9,102	115	80
Greenwood 51	118,250	1,197	97	81
McCormick	90,852	1,070	85	82
Newberry	225,428	5,751	39	83
Dillon 1	25,455	901	28	84
Dillon 2	0	3,688	0	85
Dillon 3	0	1,486	0	86
State Total	\$826,323,777	652,435	\$1,267	
District Median			\$476	

See "References for Tables."

References for Tables

- Table 1 Summary Tape File 1A, 2000 (U S Dept. of Commerce Bureau of the Census)
- Table 2. Summary Set 1 Extract, in *School District Data Book 2000 Census School District Special Tabulation* (National Center for Education Statistics US Dept. of Education CD-ROM) Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg Four from preconsolidated Districts One Four, and Eight, and Orangeburg Five from preconsolidated Districts Two, Five and Six. State figure equals the sum of district figures plus the Fort Jackson military installation Figures for Marion District Seven were combined from the preconsolidated Marion Districts Three and Four
- Table 3 See table 2 above Additionally 1990 Census Summary Tape File 1 (U S Dept of Commerce Bureau of the Census) Dorchester District Four figures for 1980 were obtained by combining figures for Dorchester County Districts One and Three State figures are taken from *2000 Census of Population General Population Characteristics South Carolina* (U S Dept. of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration Bureau of the Census) District figures are estimates derived from county data and may not match county figures, sum of district figures may not equal state figures
- Table 4 Summary File Set 1 Extract. Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One Four and Eight; and Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two Five and Six. State figure equals the sum of district figures plus the Fort Jackson military installation Figures for Marion District Seven were combined from the consolidated Marion Districts Three and Four
- Table 5 Summary Tape File 1A.
- Table 6 Summary Tape File 1A, table P12
- Table 7 See table 4 above
- Table 8 See table 4 above Additionally 1990 Census Summary Tape File 1 State figures were taken from the *2000 Census of Population*. District figures are estimates derived from county data and may not match county figures sum of district figures may not equal state figures.

- Table 9 Summary Tape File 1A, table P16 Total families were taken from Summary Tape File 1A, the complete census file and will not match total families in table 21 from Summary Tape File 3A, a sample 2000 census file (U S Dept. of Commerce Bureau of the Census)
- Table 10 See table 4 above
- Table 11 Summary Tape File 3A, table P57
- Table 12 South Carolina Budget and Control Board provisional population estimates as of July 1, 2002 prepared by the Division of Research and Statistical Services Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
- Table 13 See table 12 above Additionally 2000 Census of Population General Population Characteristics South Carolina
- Table 14 See table 13 above
- Table 15 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02 (SDE Office of Finance), "Enrollment in Private and Parochial Schools 2001-02 (SDE Office of Research); and "Title VI Private School Participation for FY 2003 (SDE, Office of School Quality). South Carolina Budget and Control Board provisional population estimates as of July 1, 2002 prepared by the Division of Research and Statistical Services. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
- Table 16 "South Carolina Voting History and Statistics " 2000 Statewide General Election in *South Carolina Election Report* (South Carolina Election Commission n d)
- Table 17 "South Carolina Teenage Pregnancy Data Population Estimated Pregnancies Live Births Live Births to Unmarried Mothers Fetal Deaths, Abortions, and Out-of-State Abortions with Rates, Female Residents Age 14-17 2000-01" in the *South Carolina Teen Pregnancy Data Book, 2000-01* (S C Dept of Health and Environmental Control Division of Biostatistics Office of Public Health and Information Systems 2002) Estimated pregnancies equal total live births plus abortions plus fetal deaths to girls aged fourteen to seventeen. Estimated pregnancies rate calculated per 100 population
- Table 18 "2002 County Crime Rates per 10 000 Population " in *Crime in South Carolina 2002* (South Carolina Law Enforcement Division 2002)
- Table 19 Summary File Set 1 Extract. State figure equals the sum of district figures plus the Fort Jackson military installation.

- Table 20 See table 19 above Additionally figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One, Four, and Eight Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two, Five and Six, and Marion Seven from preconsolidated Districts Three and Four
- Table 21 Summary Tape File 3A, tables P80A and P123 Total of 2000 families with related children ages birth to seventeen is an estimate based on Summary Tape File 3A sample census file and will not match the figure in table 9 from Summary Tape File 1A, the complete census file
- Table 22 Summary Tape File 3A, tables P80A and P123
- Table 23 Calculations prepared by the SDE Office of Research from the "Statistical Report. Taxable Year 2002" (R.D TXPI1840) supplied by the South Carolina Department of Revenue and Taxation
- Table 24 See table 23 above
- Table 25 See table 23 above
- Table 26 See table 23 above
- Table 27 *Covered Employment and Wages in South Carolina 2001* (S C Employment Security Commission, Labor Market Information Division, 2001)
- Table 28 *Per Capita Personal Income in South Carolina Counties* (U S Dept. of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, June 2000)
- Table 29 See table 28, above.
- Table 30 *South Carolina's Labor Force and Industry* (South Carolina Employment Security Commission, Labor Market Information Division 2002). The labor force data were projected from an annual benchmark derived from the Current Population Survey and represent employment and unemployment by place of residence These data are not strictly comparable to place-of-work data Total employment includes agricultural employment and all other nonagricultural employment (self-employed unpaid family and workers in private households). Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

- Table 31 *South Carolina's Labor Force and Industry 2001* All nonagricultural wage and salary employment data are reported by establishment or place-of-work basis. State totals may not equal the sum of county figures due to rounding procedures and the inability to allocate workers in certain industries to specific counties.
- Table 32 See table 31 above.
- Table 33 See table 31 above.
- Table 34 See table 31 above.
- Table 35 See table 31, above.
- Table 36 See table 31 above. Includes services related to agriculture as well as the wide range of services to individuals and business establishments.
- Table 37 *South Carolina's Labor Force and Industry 2001* All nonagricultural wage and salary employment data are reported by establishment or place-of-work basis. State totals may not equal the sum of county figures due to rounding procedures and the inability to allocate workers in certain industries to specific counties.
- Table 38 *South Carolina Agricultural Statistics: Crops, Livestock, and Poultry 2000–2002*, (preliminary 2000 data from South Carolina Agricultural Statistics Service, October 2001); and the South Carolina Budget and Control Board provisional population estimates as of July 1, 2002. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
- Table 39 "Gross and Net Taxable Sales in South Carolina—Amended March 2003" S.C. Dept. of Revenue and Taxation, Administrative Division, and South Carolina Budget and Control Board provisional population estimates as of July 1, 2002. State total for net taxable sales includes \$3,950,530,401.16 that was not allocated to specific counties. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
- Table 40 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001–02.
- Table 41 See table 40 above.
- Table 42 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001–02, "Enrollment in Private and Parochial Schools," 2001–02, and "Title VI Private School Participation for FY 2002." Some private schools failed for various reasons to submit a survey form in 2001–02. Therefore the totals in the report are known to be incomplete. This table does, however, represent the majority of private school students in the state.

- Table 43 "35-Day Enrollment Report " 2001-02 (SDE Office of Finance)
- Table 44 See table 43 above
- Table 45 35-Day Enrollment Report 1991-92 and "Precode Enrollment File " 2001-02
- Table 46 See table 45 above
- Table 47 See table 45 above
- Table 48 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 1990-91 and 2001-02
- Table 49 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 1997-98 and 2001-02
- Table 50 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report " 2001-02
- Table 51 "College Freshman Report" (SDE Office of Research) Those 2001 completers enrolled in degree programs of technical education colleges are included in the figures for those entering college " Completers include diploma state certificate and local certificate recipients
- Table 52 "College Freshman Report." Completers include diploma state certificate and local certificate recipients
- Table 53 See table 52 above
- Table 54 *Fourth Quarter Report, 2001-02* (SDE, Office of Lifelong Learning Adult Education) Excludes Technical Education Centers, Department of Corrections, Vocational Rehabilitation, Spartanburg AWARE and Laurens Literacy
- Table 55 Free and reduced-lunch data "Precode Enrollment File " 2001-02 SDE Office of Research. Some districts do not make meals available to kindergarten students. Also students in all grades may be eligible for free or reduced-price meals but they may choose not to apply or to participate in the meal program. Therefore, the number of eligible students shown in this table may be smaller than the total number of eligible students
- Table 56 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02 and the South Carolina Education Finance Act of 1977 Kindergarten pupils have a weighting of 1.30

- Table 57 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report, 2001-02 and the South Carolina Education Finance Act. Primary pupils have a weighting of 1.24
- Table 58 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report, 2001-02, and the South Carolina Education Finance Act. Elementary pupils have a weighting of 1.00
- Table 59 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02, and the South Carolina Education Finance Act. High school pupils have a weighting of 1.25
- Table 60 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report" 2001-02 and the South Carolina Education Finance Act.
- Table 61 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02, and the South Carolina Education Finance Act. Vocational pupils have a weighting of 1.29
- Table 62 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02 and the South Carolina Education Finance Act.
- Table 63 "Student Accountability System District Report, Fiscal Year 2001-02" and "District Report, Summer 2000" (SDE, Office of Finance). Academically gifted counts include the number of students served as reported on the 135-day school report and the number of new students served as reported on the summer school report. Counts are low in grades one and two because programs are not state funded. Counts are low in grades eleven and twelve because academically gifted pupils in these grades generally enroll in advanced placement courses.
- Table 64 Analysis prepared by SDE Office of Research, from data tape provided by the College Board, Advanced Placement Program. Number of advanced placement examinations taken exceeds the number of candidates because some candidates pursue more than one college-level course. State total includes students in the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics.
- Table 65 "Precode Enrollment File" 1999-2000 and "School Dropout Listings" 1999-2000 (SDE Office of Safe Schools and Youth Services).
- Table 66 "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02

- Table 67 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* (SDE Office of Finance) Professional staff includes personnel for PCS (Professional Certified Staff) position codes 01-18 44-46 48-85, 96, and 99 See appendix D for position code identification Includes staff with an education/certification level of a bachelor's degree and bachelor's degree plus eighteen hours.
- Table 68 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* Professional staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 01-18 44-46 48-85 96 and 99 Includes staff with an education/certification level of a master's degree
- Table 69 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* Professional staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 01-18 44-46 48-85 96 and 99 Includes staff with an education/certification level of a six-year certificate or a doctorate
- Table 70 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* Administrative staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 01-02 13-16 45 and 48-52 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 71 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* Supervisory staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 44 53-84 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 72. *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02.* Teaching staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 04 05 08 09 and 46 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 73 *Professional Certified Staff File, End-of-Year 2001-02* Special education teaching staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 03 06, 07 and 17 See appendix D for position code identification.
- Table 74 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02.* Guidance and Media staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 11 and 10 respectively See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 75 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02* Professional staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 01-18, 44-46 48-85 96 and 99 See appendix D for position code identification.
- Table 76 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02 and 135-Day Membership and Attendance Report, 2001-02* Staff counts are in full-time equivalency Administrative staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 01-02 13-16 45 and 48-52 See appendix D for position code identification

- Table 77 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year, 2001-02, and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report" 2001-02* Supervisory staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 44 and 53-84 See appendix D for position code identification.
- Table 78 *Professional Certified Staff File, End-of-Year 2001-02, and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report" 2001-02* Teaching staff includes personnel for PCS position codes 03, 05-09 17 and 46 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 79 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02, and 135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02* Guidance staff includes personnel for PCS position code 11 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 80 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02 and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02* Media staff includes personnel for PCS position code 10 See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 81 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 2001-02.* Includes personnel for PCS position codes 03 05-09 17 and 46 and excludes county personnel in multidistrict organizations. See appendix D for position code identification
- Table 82 *Professional Certified Staff File End-of-Year 1999-2000 and 2001-02* Includes only full-time staff employed at least 140 days in PCS position codes 03 and 05-09 Teachers in child development centers and area vocational centers are excluded The "State Total" denotes turnover rate of teachers for the state as a whole and is not derived from district figures
- Table 83 "2001-02 State Minimum Salary Schedule," and "District Salary Schedules 2001-02" (SDE Office of Finance)
- Table 84 See table 83, above
- Table 85 See table 83 above
- Table 86 See table 83 above
- Table 87 "Average Salary Summary, 2001-02" (SDE, Office of Research). Includes only full-time staff for PCS position codes 03-09 See appendix D for position code identification.

- Table 88 South Carolina Budget and Control Board provisional population estimates as of July 1 2002 prepared by the Division of Research and Statistical Services and the InSite™ database 2001-02 (SDE Office of Finance) Excludes expenditures for capital projects and debt service where applicable includes current operating expenditures for county board area vocational centers and/or alternative schools) Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
- Table 89 School district audits 2001-02 and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report, 2001-02 Where applicable figures include pro rata share of the county board area vocational center and/or alternative school receipts Revenue and pupil count for the McCarthy-Teszler Facility are included in Spartanburg District Seven Membership includes only K-12 pupils See appendix C for a listing of accounts Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
- Table 90 See table 89 above
- Table 91 See table 89 above
- Table 92 See table 89 above
- Table 93 See table 89 above Additionally *Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina 1997-98* table 88 (SDE Office of Research 1990). Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One Four and Eight; Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two Five and Six; and Marion District Seven from the preconsolidated Districts Three and Four
- Table 94 *School District Audits 2001-02 and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02* Where applicable figures include pro rata share of the county board area vocational center and/or alternative school receipts Revenue and pupil count for the McCarthy-Teszler Facility are included in Spartanburg District Seven Membership includes only K-12 pupils. See appendix C for a listing of accounts Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
- Table 95 See table 94 above
- Table 96 See table 94 above
- Table 97 "Assessed Valuation as of 12/31/01" (SDE Office of Finance). Pupil count is the 135-Day Average Daily Membership for K-12

- Table 98 See table 97 above. Additionally *Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina 1991-92*, table 93 (SDE, Office of Research 1990). Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One, Four and Eight, Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two Five, and Six; and Marion District Seven from the preconsolidated Districts Three and Four
- Table 99 "Index of Taxpaying Ability April 17 2001" (South Carolina Department of Revenue Property Tax Division); and "135-Day Membership and Attendance Report," 2001-02 Pupil count is the 135-day average daily membership for K-12
- Table 100 Supportive information from the South Carolina school district superintendents, 2001-02 State averages were calculated by weighting the eighty-five district levies by the 2001-02 assessed valuations
- Table 101 Supportive information from the South Carolina school district superintendents, 2001-02 and *Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina 1988-89* table 96 Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One Four and Eight, and Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two Five and Six and Marion District Seven from preconsolidated Districts Three and Four
- Table 102 Index of Taxpaying Ability April 17 2002" and *School District Audits 2001-02*. Where applicable figures for "Tax Revenue Current Operations" include pro rata share of the county board area vocational center and/or alternative school receipts. Revenue and pupil count for the McCarthy-Teszler Facility are included in Spartanburg District Seven. Levies for debt service are excluded. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding. Figures presented for "Tax Effort" are for comparison purposes and do not reflect funding under the Education Finance Act. Ability Index is computed from property values as of December 31 2001
- Table 103 EFA-EIA accounting, SDE, Office of Finance The funding index is based on property values as of December 31 2001 See "Meanings of Terms" for more information on the term *funding index*.

- Table 104 InSite™ database 2001-02 Excludes expenditures for capital projects and debt service where applicable includes current operating expenditures for county board area vocational centers and/or alternative schools) Membership includes only K-12 pupils Expenditures and pupil count for the McCarthy Teszler Facility are included in Spartanburg District Seven See appendix C for a listing of expenditure accounts Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
- Table 105 See table 104 above Additionally *Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina 1998-99* table 99 Figures for Orangeburg District Three were combined from the preconsolidated Orangeburg Districts Three and Seven Orangeburg District Four from preconsolidated Districts One Four, and Eight; Orangeburg District Five from preconsolidated Districts Two Five and Six, and Manon District Seven from preconsolidated Districts Three and Four
- Table 106 See table 104 above
- Table 107 See table 104 above
- Table 108 See table 104 above
- Table 109 See table 104 above
- Table 110 See table 104 above
- Table 111 See table 104, above
- Table 112 See table 104 above
- Table 113 See table 104 above
- Table 114 See table 104 above
- Table 115 See table 104 above
- Table 116 See table 104 above

**APPENDIX A
REVENUE ACCOUNTS AND EXPENDITURE FUNCTIONS
REVENUE BY SOURCE, 2000-01**

Table Number	RANKINGS Revenue	SCHOOL DISTRICT AUDITS (Schedule B)			
		Accounts			
89	local sources (including taxes)	local receipts (excludes any amounts in the debt service or school building funds)	1100s, 1200s 1400s 1500s 1700s 1910 1920 1992	1300s, 1600s, 1990	
90	state sources	state receipts (excludes any amounts in the debt service or school building funds)	3100s (excluding 3170s) 3200s 3300s 3500s (excluding 3590) 3800s 3900s		
91	federal sources	federal receipts (excludes any amounts in the debt service or school building funds)	4100s 4200s 4300s 4400s 4500s 4800s 4900s		
92	local state and federal sources	all accounts included in tables 89 through 91 listed above	---		

REVENUE BY SELECTED PURPOSE

94	local taxes for current operations	local receipts (all funds except debt service)	1100s 1200s
95	local taxes for current operations and debt service	local receipts (included in all funds)	1100s 1200s
96	capital projects*	capital lease lease purchases	5500 5600
		state school building fund EIA school building aid	3170s 3590

debt service**

* In addition to accounts 5500 5600, 3170s and 3590 amounts included in the school building fund category of any account listed in local, state, or federal revenue also are classified as capital projects

** Amounts included in the debt service fund category of any account listed in local, state or federal revenue or capital projects also are classified as debt service

APPENDIX A (Continued)
EXPENDITURES, 2000-01

RANKINGS		INSITE™ CATEGORIES	FUNCTIONS
Table Number	Expenditures		
104	current operating expenditures	total of tables 108 through 113	--
106	district leadership	deputies, senior administrators researchers and program evaluators, superintendent and school board legal services	223 231 232 259
107	school leadership	principals and assistant principals school office	233
108	instruction and instructional support	instructional teachers, substitutes instructional paraprofessionals, pupil-use technology and software instructional materials and supplies guidance and counseling, library and media, extracurricular student health and services curriculum development, teacher in-service and staff training program development, therapists, psychologists evaluators, personal attendants, social workers	100s 211-16 221 222, 224 262, 270s 300s
110	building upkeep and maintenance	building upkeep and maintenance	254
111	pupil food services	food service	256
112	transportation	transportation (excludes direct support)	255
113	safety	safety	258
114	business services	data processing business operations	252, 257 263, 264 266
115	capital projects	capital projects	253
116	debt service	debt service	500s

**APPENDIX B
POSITION CODE IDENTIFICATION
from the Professional Certified Staff (PCS) File**

PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL-ORIENTED PERSONNEL

Administrative—School

- 01 Principal
- 02 AssL Principal Copncipal
Curriculum Coordinator

Administrative—Voc Center

- 13 Director
- 14 Assistant Director
- 15 Job Placement Coordinator
- 16 Adult Program Coordinator
- 17 Other Administrative Specialists

Temporary Staff

- 19 Temporary Instructional-Oriented Staff

Professional Instructional Staff

- 03 Special Education—Itinerant
- 04 Child Development Teacher
- 05 Kindergarten Teacher
- 06 Special Education—Self-Contained
- 07 Special Education—Resource
- 08 Classroom Teacher
- 09 Other Professional Instructional Staff

Professional Instructional-Oriented Staff

- 10 Librarian/Media Specialist
- 11 Guidance Counselor
- 12 Other Prof Instructional-Oriented Staff
- 18 Junior ROTC Instructor

COUNTY/DISTRICT OFFICE PERSONNEL ONLY

Administrative

- 49 AssL Superintendent (Assoc Deputy)
- 50 District Superintendent
- 51 County Superintendent
- 52 Area Superintendent
- 53 Director of Instruction
- 54 Supervisor Elementary Educ.
- 55 Supervisor Secondary Education
- 58 Supervisor Adult Education
- 57 Director Vocational Education
- 58 Director Special Services
- 59 Director Early Childhood Educ.
- 60 Director Child Development

Consultant, Coordinator

- 61 Agriculture
- 62 Art
- 63 Business and Office Education
- 64 Distributive Education
- 65 English
- 68 Reading

- 67 Foreign Language
- 68 Health Occupations
- 69 Health, Safety Physical Educ.
- 70 Home Economics
- 71 Industrial Arts
- 72 Mathematics
- 73 Music
- 74 Science
- 75 Educational Evaluator
- 78 Social Studies
- 77 Trade and Industrial
- 78 Special Education
- 79 Driver Education
- 80 Library Services/Media Specialist
- 81 Guidance
- 82 Early Childhood
- 84 Elementary
- 85 Psychologist
- 98 District Pathways Coordinator
- 99 Other County Office/District Office Staff

APPENDIX C
INDEX OF TABLE NUMBERS

A

ability index, 102
 academically gifted students (see *gifted*)
 administrative staff (see *staff*)
 adult education (see *enrollment*)
 Advanced Placement (AP) Program
 exams taken, 64
 candidates 64
 age (see *population*)
 assessed valuation
 2000-01 97
 per pupil 97 98
 1998-99
 per pupil 98
 per pupil change 98
 average daily attendance (ADA)
 as a percent of ADM
 K-8 50
 K-12 50
 9-12 50
 average daily membership (ADM)
 135-day
 2000-01 public
 grades K-12 40-42, 76-80
 89-92 94-96 99 104 106-15
 grades 3-10 63
 grades 11-12 64
 grade 12 48 49
 per school plant, 66
 kindergarten (total and
 weighted), 56
 primary (total and weighted), 57
 elementary (total and weighted) 58
 high school (total and weighted) 59
 handicapped and homebound
 (total and weighted) 60
 vocational (total and weighted), 61
 total weighted, 62
 private (K-12) 42
 public and private (K-12), 15
 change, 1st grade (1989-90) to 12th
 grade (2000-01) 48
 change, 8th grade (1996-97) to 12th
 grade (2000-01) 49
 1996-97 8th grade 49
 1989-90 1st grade 48
 average salary (see *salary*)

B

bachelor's degree (see *degrees*)
 building upkeep and maintenance
 (see *expenditures*)
 business services (see *expenditures*)

C

capital projects (see *expenditures and
 revenue*)
 crime rate 18
 current operations (see *expenditures,
 current operating*)
 completers, high school
 total 51-53
 entering college 51
 other schools 52
 employment and other activities 53

D

debt service (see *expenditures and
 revenue*)
 degrees
 bachelor's 67
 master's 68
 six-year certificate or doctorate 69
 dropouts, grades 9-12 65

E

education experience (see *experience
 total education*)
 educational level (see *population, 2000*)
 employment
 civilian labor force 30
 construction and mining 32
 manufacturing 31
 total nonagricultural, 31-37
 transportation and public utilities, 33
 wholesale and retail trade 34
 finance insurance and real estate 35
 services, 36
 government, 37

E (cont'd)

enrollment, 35-day
2000-01
grades K-12 43 45
white, 44, 46
minority 44 47
grades 9-12, 65
1990-91
grades K-12, 45
white 46
minority 47
change from 1990-91 to 2000-01
grades K-12, 45
white 46
minority 47
enrollment, adult education
basic 54
high school 54
total 54
expenditures
capital projects 115
per pupil 115
debt service 116
per pupil, 116
expenditures current operating
1998-99
per pupil, 105
2000-01
total, 88 104 105
per capita, 88
per pupil 104 105
building upkeep and maintenance
110
per pupil 110
business services 114
per pupil, 114
district leadership, 106
per pupil, 106
instruction and support 108
per pupil, 108
pupil food services 111
per pupil 111
pupil transportation, 112
per pupil, 112
safety 113
per pupil, 113
school leadership 107
per pupil 107
increase from 1998-99 to 2000-01
per pupil, 105

E (cont'd)

experience total education
administrators 70
supervisors 71
teachers, excluding special education
72
special education teachers, 73
guidance and media staff 74
professional staff 75

F

families
total, 20
with related children ages 0-17
total 9 21
single parent, 9
female householder no husband
present, 22
farm products
value 38
per capita value 38
federal revenue (see revenue)
fiscal capacity (see wealth)
food services (see expenditures)
funding index, 103

G

gifted students, academically
served grades 1-12, 63
served grades 3-10 63
graduates 1998 (see completers)
guidance staff (see staff)

I

income
median household 19
personal income
per capita 1997 28 29
per capita 1993, 29
per capita increase 1995-99 29
instruction (see expenditures)

L

labor force (see employment)
leadership district and school (see
expenditures)

L (cont'd)

levy (see *tax levy*)
local revenue (see *revenue*)
 local taxes (see *tax revenue and local revenue*)
lunch free or reduced eligible 55

M

male
 percent teachers, 81
master's degree (see *degrees*)
media staff (see *staff*)
membership (see *average daily membership*)
membership weighted (see *average daily membership*)
mills (see *tax levy*)

N

net taxable sales (see *tax sales*)
nonpublic (private) school (see *average daily membership*)

P

personal income (see *income*)
population
 1990
 total 3
 urban, 8
 2000
 white 2, 13
 minority 2 4 14
 total 2-5 7
 rural 7
 urban 7 8
 age
 median age 1
 under 5 5
 5-17 years 5 6
 white 8
 minority 6
 18-64 years 5
 25 years and over 10
 less than 12th-grade education, 10
 25 years and over 11
 at least a Bachelor's degree or equivalent, 11

P (cont'd)

65 years and over 5
change from 1990 to 2000
 total 3
 urban 8
2000 estimated
 white 12, 13
 minority 12 14
 total 12 15 38 39 88
change from 1990 to 2000
 white 13
 minority 14
poverty level, 20-22
pregnancies
 percent among females
 ages 14-17 17
private school membership (see *average daily membership*)
professional staff (see *staff*)

R

ratio
 membership to administrative staff 76
 membership to supervisory staff 77
 membership to teaching staff 78
 membership to guidance staff 79
 membership to media staff 80
revenue
 2000-01
 local 89
 per pupil 89
 state 90
 per pupil 90
 federal 91
 per pupil, 91
 local, state and federal 92
 per pupil, 92 93
 capital projects and debt service 96
 per pupil, 96
 equalized 102
 1997-98
 local, state and federal per pupil 93
 per pupil increase from 1997-98 to 2000-01 93
 rural (see *population*)

S

safety (see *expenditures*)
salary
 average weekly 2000 27

S (cont'd)

teacher salary schedules
bachelor's degree and zero years
experience 83
master's degree and zero years
experience 84
bachelor's degree plus eighteen
hours and ten years
experience 85
master's degree and seventeen years
experience 86
average for teachers, 87
sales (see *tax*)
school plant
by membership (see *average daily
membership*)
six-year certificate (see *degrees*)
staff
professional 67-69
administrative 76
supervisory 77
teaching 78 81
guidance, 79
media, 80
state revenue (see *revenue*)
supervisory staff (see *staff*)

T

tax effort, 102
tax revenue, 102
tax, sales 39
tax, state taxable income
percent of returns <\$8,000 23
percent of returns \$8 000 to
\$12,999 24
percent of returns \$13 000 to
\$24 999 25
percent of returns >=\$25 000 26
taxes
current operations, 94
per pupil, 94
current operations and debt service 95
per pupil, 95
tax levy in mills
2000-01
current operations, 100
debt service, 100
total levy 100 101
1998-99
total levy 101
change in tax levy 101

T (cont'd)

teaching staff (see *staff*)
teacher salaries (see *salary*)
teacher turnover rate, 82
technology and software (see
expenditures)
training, teacher in-service (see
expenditures)
transportation (see *expenditures*)

U

unemployment (see *employment*)
number unemployed, 30
urban (see *population*)

V

voters 2000
total registered 16
total voted 16

W

wealth
fiscal capacity 99
per pupil 99


Total Printing Cost	\$1 744 75
Total number of documents printed	175
Cost per copy	\$9 97

The South Carolina Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race color national origin, sex, or disability in admission to treatment in or employment in its programs and activities. Inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policies should be made to the director of the Office of Human Resources 1429 Senate Street Columbia South Carolina 29201 803-734-8505

TEX _ 13248

DEF_3225-0384

REC038702



A publication of the
South Carolina Department of Education
Inez M Tenenbaum, State Superintendent


1429 Senate Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Phone 803-734-8492 Fax 803-734-8624
www.myschools.com

TEX _ 13249

DEF_3225-0385

REC038703


Total Expenditures Per Pupil 2001-2002



Source: Defendants Ex. 127, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000

Defendants Ex #3254A 8


Per Pupil Expenditures-Instruction 2001-02



10/22/02 10:27

Defendants Exh #3254B 9

Per Pupil Expenditures-Face to Face Teaching 2001-2002




Plaintiff Expenditure 2001-2002

Defendants Exh #3254C

DEF_3254_00C

REC038706

Per Pupil Expenditures-Instructional Teachers 2001-2002




State Avg Good/Ex Avg Plaintiff Avg Allendale Dillon 2 Florence 4 Hampton 2 Jasper Lee Marion 7 Orangeburg 3

our c sa ll r c t ll DAI

Defendants' Exh #3254D 1


Per Pupil Expenditures-Substitutes 2001-2002



State Dept of Education - Atlanta, GA

Defendants Exh #3254E | 12


Per Pupil Expenditures-Instructional Paraprofessionals 2001-2002



Source: Defendants' Exhibit 3272 2002-11-10 P.D. TA

Defendants' Exh #3254F 13


Per Pupil Expenditures-Classroom Materials 2001-2002



Source: Defense Ex # 3224 2002 INSITE 76


Defendants Exh #3254G 14

Per Pupil Expenditures- Pupil-Use Technology and Software 2001-2002



Source: Data compiled by Exh #3254H 2002 INSITE DA


Per Pupil Expenditures- Instructional Materials & Supplies 2001-2002



Source: Defendants Exh #3254-001 2002 INDIANNA STATE DATA

Defendants Exh #32541 16


Per Pupil Expenditures- Instructional Support 2001-2002



Source: California Department of Education, 2002 IPSE DATA

Defendants Exh #3254J | 17

Per Pupil Expenditures-Pupil Support 2001-2002




State Average Plaintiff Average Allegheny District 12 Florence Harrison Jackson Lee Marion Orangeburg

the Defendant Ex # 3254-00K INS RE

Defendants Exh #3254K 18


Per Pupil Expenditures- Guidance & Counseling 2001-2002



Source: US Department of Education, #222200, INSIDE DATA

Defendants Exh #3254L | 19


Per Pupil Expenditures-Library & Media 2001-2002



PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 10

Defendants Exh #3254M | 20


Per Pupil Expenditures-Extracurricular 2001-2002



Source: DEF Exh #3254N 2002 SITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254N 21


Per Pupil Expenditures- Teacher Support 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254P 23

Per Pupil Expenditures- Curriculum Development 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254Q 24

TEX_020565

REC038717A 0003

Per Pupil Expenditures- Program Support 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254S 26

TEX_020567

REC038717A 0004


Per Pupil Expenditures- Program Development 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254T 27

Per Pupil Expenditures-Therapists, Psychologists, Evaluators, Personal Attendants, & Social Workers 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254U 28

TEX_020569

REC038717A 0006


Per Pupil Expenditures-Operations 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254V 29

Per Pupil Expenditures- Non-Instructional Pupil Services 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254W 30

TEX_020571

REC038717A 0008

Per Pupil Expenditures-Transportation 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254X 31

TEX_020572

REC038717A 0009

Per Pupil Expenditures-Food Service 2001-2002




Source Defendants' Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254Y 32

TEX_020573

REC038717A 0010


Per Pupil Expenditures-Safety 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254Z 33

Per Pupil Expenditures- Facilities-Building Upkeep & Maintenance 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AA 34

TEX_020575

REC038717A 0012


Per Pupil Expenditures- Business Services 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AB 35


Per Pupil Expenditures- Data Processing 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AC 36

Per Pupil Expenditures- Business Operations 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AD 37

TEX_020578

REC038717A 0015


Per Pupil Expenditures-Leadership 2001-2002



Source Defendants' Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AE 38

Per Pupil Expenditures- School Management 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AF 39

TEX_020580

REC038717A 0017


Per Pupil Expenditures- Principals & Assistant Principals 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AG 40


Per Pupil Expenditures-School Office 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 INSITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AH 41

Per Pupil Expenditures- Program Management 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AI 42

TEX_020583

REC038717A 0020

Per Pupil Expenditures- Deputies, Senior Administrators, Researchers & Program Evaluators 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AJ 43

TEX_020584

REC038717A 0021

Per Pupil Expenditures- District Management 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AK 44

TEX_020585

REC038717A 0022

Per Pupil Expenditures- Superintendent & School Board 2001-2002




Source Defendants' Exh #3272 2002 INSITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AL 45

TEX_020586

REC038717A 0023


Per Pupil Expenditures- Student Health & Services 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272, 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #32540 22

Per Pupil Expenditures- In-Service & Staff Training 2001-2002




Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254R 25

TEX_020566

REC038718


Percentage of Students in Selected Districts 2001-2002



STATE SUPERVISOR 2002 FISCAL YEAR

Defendants Exh #3254AM 6

Percentage of Total Spending in Selected Districts 2001-2002



REC038720

Source: Defendants Exhibit #3254AN 2002 INSITE D 14

Defendants Exh #3254AN 47

2001 IN\$ITE			
GOOD & EXCELLENT DISTRICTS		PLAINTIFF DISTRICTS	
Total Expenditures	\$2 061,088,080	Total Expenditures	\$146,274 335
# Of Students	304 788	# Of Students	18 621
Per Pupil Spending	\$6,762	Per Pupil Spending	\$7,855

Difference	\$1,093
------------	---------

Source Defendants Exh #3253 2001 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AO

2002 IN\$ITE			
GOOD & EXCELLENT DISTRICTS		PLAINTIFF DISTRICTS	
Total Expenditures	\$2,296,219,295	Total Expenditures	\$153 839 631
# Of Students	329 452	# Of Students	18,355
Per Pupil Spending	\$6,970	Per Pupil Spending	\$8,381

Difference	\$1,411
------------	---------

Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 IN\$ITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254AP

2001			
Remove Federal \$ From Total Per Pupil Spending			
	Plaintiffs	Good & Excellent	State
Total	\$7 855	\$6 762	\$7,010
Federal	\$1 196	\$486	\$656
Total Spending Less Federal	\$6,659	\$6,276	\$6,354

Difference Between Plaintiffs & Good & Excellent	\$383
Difference Between Plaintiffs & State	\$305

Source Defendants Exh #2907 Rankings Table 91

Defendants' Exh #3254AQ

4

2002			
Remove Federal \$ From Total Per Pupil Spending			
	Plaintiffs	Good & Excellent	State
Total	\$8,381	\$6,970	\$7,281
Federal	\$1,379	\$558	\$752
Total Spending Less Federal	\$7,002	\$6,412	\$6,529

Difference Between Plaintiffs & Good & Excellent	\$591
Difference Between Plaintiffs & State	\$473

Source Defendants Exh #3225 Rankings Table 91

Defendants' Exh #3254AR

5

2002 State v Plaintiff Total Expenditures Per Pupil Removing Effect of Extra Tax effort		
	State	Plaintiffs
Total Spending Per Pupil	\$7 281	\$8 381
Less Federal Dollars	\$752	\$1,379
	\$6,529	\$7 002
Less Extra Effort	\$0	\$450
Total	\$6,529	\$6,552


DIFFERENCE	\$23
-------------------	-------------

Source Defendants Exh #3225 Rankings Table 89 102

Defendants' Exh #3254AT

7


Educational Appropriations Per Fiscal Year from Total Funds- Total Spending



Defendants Ex #3254AU

Defendants Ex #3254AU, 48

Educational Appropriations Per Fiscal Year from Total Funds- Per Capita Spending




Source: Defendants Exh #3220

Defendants Exh #3254AV 49

REC03872

Total State Education Appropriations FY 1993-1994 Through 2001-2002



REC038_28


TEX_17010b

FILED BY 841 11

Defendants' Exh #3254BL 65

135 Day ADM for State

Fiscal Years 1993-1994 to 2001-2002




REC038729

Defendants' Exh #3254BM 10

LEY 070507

Percent Change in Dollars Vs 135 Day ADM Fiscal Years 1993-1994 to 2001-2002




Defendants' Exh #3254BN 67

REC038730


IE/ 020608

Percent Change in ADM 1993/94- 2001/02 in Plaintiff & Good and Excellent Districts



Defendants Exh #3254BO 6c

Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering School or the Workplace District Median




Source: D. E. H. + 2/2/00, p. 5, 12, 100/02

Defendants Exh #3254BQ 70

EF_3254_08L


REC036732

Percent of 2000¹ High School Completers Entering
School or the Workplace
State Average



Source: Data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2000


Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering School or the Workplace Allendale



Source: Defendant #3225 Tables 5, 22 and 53

Defendants Exh #3254BS 72


1
Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering
School or the Workplace
Dillon 2




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table B-102 and B-103

Defendants Exh #3254BT 75

Percent of 2000¹ High School Completers Entering
 School or the Workplace
 Florence 4




¹
Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering
School or the Workplace
Hampton 2



Source: Defendant's Exhibit #3254BV, p. 75

Defendants Exh #3254BV | 75


4
 Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering
 School or the Workplace
 Jasper



Source: Data from Exhibit #3254, Tables 51, 52 and 53

Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering
School or the Workplace


Lee



Source: U.S. Dept. of Education, Table 1.1.2.1


Defendants Exh #3254BX 77

Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering School or the Workplace Marion 7




Defendants Exh #3254BY 7,

Percent of 2000 High School Completers Entering School or the Workplace Orangeburg 3



Total Expenditures Per Pupil 2001-2002



Source Defendants Exh #3272 2002 INSITE DATA

Defendants' Exh #3254A 15

REC038742

DEF_3254A

Average Annual Earnings of Full-time Teachers and Registered Nurses
(Charleston, North Charleston, SC May 2004)






Figure 6. National Sensation Survey

Average Weekly Earnings of Full Time Teachers and Registered Nurses
Charleston North Charleston SC May 2002




Source: National Longitudinal Survey

Average Weekly Earnings
Full Time Public School Teachers and Other Occupations
Greenville Spartanburg Anderson SC
October 2002




REC038745

Average Weekly Earnings
Full Time Public School Teachers and Other Occupations
Augusta Aiken GA SC
Feb 2004



Source: U.S. Department of Labor - National Compensation Survey


Average Weekly Earnings
 Full Time Public School Teachers and Other Occupations
 Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC
 June 2002



Source: U.S. Department of Labor, National Compensation Survey

REC038747


Average Weekly Earnings
Full Time Public School Teachers and Other Occupations
Charleston North Charleston SC
May 2002



Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Economic Analysis

REC038748

Average Hourly Earnings
Full Time Public School Teachers and Other Occupations
Charlotte-Gastonia-Hock Hill NC SC
June 2002




Source: U.S. Department of Labor, National Compensation Survey

Revenue Per Pupil Spending from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

ALLENDALE

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 532 72	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 554 60	4 1%
1977/1978	\$ 589 69	6 3%
1978/1979	\$ 616 69	4 6%
1979/1980	\$ 729 15	18 2%
1980/1981	\$ 866 79	18 9%
1981/1982	\$ 1,131 40	30 5%
1982/1983	\$ 992 41	-12 3%
1983/1984	\$ 1,087 86	9 6%
1984/1985	\$ 1,474 63	35 6%
1985/1986	\$ 1,590 73	7 9%
1986/1987	\$ 1,663 57	4 6%
1987/1988	\$ 2,402 28	44 4%
1988/1989	\$ 2,212 47	-7 9%
1989/1990	\$ 2,461 41	11 3%
1990/1991	\$ 2,668 53	8 4%
1991/1992	\$ 2,514 50	-5 8%
1992/1993	\$ 2,603 83	3 6%
1993/1994	\$ 2,612 13	0 3%
1994/1995	\$ 2,636 83	0 9%
1995/1996	\$ 3,007 71	14 1%
1996/1997	\$ 3,149 00	4 7%
1997/1998	\$ 3,502 00	11 2%
1998/1999	\$ 3,913 00	11 7%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 5,510 00	40 8%
2001/2002	\$ 5,182 00	-6 0%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		872 7%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina



TEX_13350

DEF_3280

REC038750

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

DILLON 2

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 482 37	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 500 14	3 7%
1977/1978	\$ 531 95	6 4%
1978/1979	\$ 613 44	15 3%
1979/1980	\$ 686 13	11 8%
1980/1981	\$ 863 87	25 9%
1981/1982	\$ 1,137 29	31 7%
1982/1983	\$ 1,096 50	-3 6%
1983/1984	\$ 1,153 05	5 2%
1984/1985	\$ 1,485 96	28 9%
1985/1986	\$ 1,657 71	11 6%
1986/1987	\$ 1,761 71	6 3%
1987/1988	\$ 2,089 94	18 6%
1988/1989	\$ 2,190 35	4 8%
1989/1990	\$ 2,365 47	8 0%
1990/1991	\$ 2,522 83	6 7%
1991/1992	\$ 2,481 31	-1 6%
1992/1993	\$ 2,592 09	4 5%
1993/1994	\$ 2,663 45	2 8%
1994/1995	\$ 2,684 00	0 8%
1995/1996	\$ 3,010 00	12 1%
1996/1997	\$ 3,118 00	3 6%
1997/1998	\$ 3,353 00	7 5%
1998/1999	\$ 3,554 00	6 0%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 4,078 00	14 7%
2001/2002	\$ 4,342 00	6 5%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		800 1%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13351

DEF_3280-0002

REC038751

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

FLORENCE 4

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 456 67	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 487 23	6 7%
1977/1978	\$ 567 71	16 5%
1978/1979	\$ 636 54	12 1%
1979/1980	\$ 775 99	21 9%
1980/1981	\$ 914 76	17 9%
1981/1982	\$ 1,248 98	36 5%
1982/1983	\$ 1,115 90	-10 7%
1983/1984	\$ 1,323 98	18 6%
1984/1985	\$ 1,823 66	37 7%
1985/1986	\$ 1,842 44	1 0%
1986/1987	\$ 1,825 93	-0 9%
1987/1988	\$ 2,203 52	20 7%
1988/1989	\$ 2,287 09	3 8%
1989/1990	\$ 2,533 77	10 8%
1990/1991	\$ 2,722 89	7 5%
1991/1992	\$ 2,598 13	-4 6%
1992/1993	\$ 2,743 44	5 6%
1993/1994	\$ 2,856 23	4 1%
1994/1995	\$ 2,877 31	0 7%
1995/1996	\$ 3,301 15	14 7%
1996/1997	\$ 3,428 00	3 8%
1997/1998	\$ 3,688 00	7 6%
1998/1999	\$ 4,251 00	15 3%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 5,457 00	28 4%
2001/2002	\$ 4,961 00	\$ (0 09)
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		986 3%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13352

DEF_3280-0003

REC038752

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

HAMPTON 2

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 519 09	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 532 76	2 6%
1977/1978	\$ 528 41	-0 8%
1978/1979	\$ 654 96	23 9%
1979/1980	\$ 752 35	14 9%
1980/1981	\$ 905 26	20 3%
1981/1982	\$ 1,193 00	31 8%
1982/1983	\$ 1,098 81	-7 9%
1983/1984	\$ 1,265 72	15 2%
1984/1985	\$ 1,648 40	30 2%
1985/1986	\$ 1,749 81	6 2%
1986/1987	\$ 1,809 55	3 4%
1987/1988	\$ 2,239 60	23 8%
1988/1989	\$ 2,678 40	19 6%
1989/1990	\$ 2,871 48	7 2%
1990/1991	\$ 2,773 19	-3 4%
1991/1992	\$ 2,896 17	4 4%
1992/1993	\$ 2,733 91	-5 6%
1993/1994	\$ 2,818 26	3 1%
1994/1995	\$ 2,900 00	2 9%
1995/1996	\$ 3,448 32	18 9%
1996/1997	\$ 3,636 00	5 4%
1997/1998	\$ 3,776 00	3 9%
1998/1999	\$ 4,272 00	13 1%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 6,006 00	40 6%
2001/2002	\$ 5,321 00	\$ (0 11)
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		925 1%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13353

DEF_3280-0004

REC038753

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

JASPER

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 492 98	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 522 02	5 9%
1977/1978	\$ 550 17	5 4%
1978/1979	\$ 594 18	8 0%
1979/1980	\$ 685 80	15 4%
1980/1981	\$ 805 51	17 5%
1981/1982	\$ 929 13	15 3%
1982/1983	\$ 1,012 32	9 0%
1983/1984	\$ 1,146 10	13 2%
1984/1985	\$ 1,535 70	34 0%
1985/1986	\$ 1,672 54	8 9%
1986/1987	\$ 1,713 45	2 4%
1987/1988	\$ 2,031 81	18 6%
1988/1989	\$ 2,107 96	3 7%
1989/1990	\$ 2,264 09	7 4%
1990/1991	\$ 2,443 65	7 9%
1991/1992	\$ 2,352 24	-3 7%
1992/1993	\$ 2,494 09	6 0%
1993/1994	\$ 2,532 89	1 6%
1994/1995	\$ 2,277 96	-10 1%
1995/1996	\$ 2,991 96	31 3%
1996/1997	\$ 3,091 00	3 3%
1997/1998	\$ 3,451 00	11 6%
1998/1999	\$ 3,889 00	12 7%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 4,958 00	27 5%
2001/2002	\$ 4,540 00	-8 4%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		820 9%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13354

DEF_3280-0005

REC038754

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

LEE

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 508 48	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 544 58	7 1%
1977/1978	\$ 585 75	7 6%
1978/1979	\$ 651 98	11 3%
1979/1980	\$ 778 12	19 3%
1980/1981	\$ 917 33	17 9%
1981/1982	\$ 1,184 52	29 1%
1982/1983	\$ 1,011 46	-14 6%
1983/1984	\$ 1,180 57	16 7%
1984/1985	\$ 1,604 77	35 9%
1985/1986	\$ 1,805 21	12 5%
1986/1987	\$ 1,812 98	0 4%
1987/1988	\$ 2,150 31	18 6%
1988/1989	\$ 2,304 98	7 2%
1989/1990	\$ 2,515 24	9 1%
1990/1991	\$ 2,637 05	4 8%
1991/1992	\$ 2,575 92	-2 3%
1992/1993	\$ 2,650 70	2 9%
1993/1994	\$ 2,697 27	1 8%
1994/1995	\$ 2,759 02	2 3%
1995/1996	\$ 3,100 00	12 4%
1996/1997	\$ 3,285 00	6 0%
1997/1998	\$ 3,587 00	9 2%
1998/1999	\$ 3,908 00	8 9%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 4,983 00	27 5%
2001/2002	\$ 4,774 00	-4 2%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		838 9%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13355

DEF_3280-0006

REC038755

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

MARION 3

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 538 46	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 582 85	8 2%
1977/1978	\$ 558 14	-4 2%
1978/1979	\$ 706 64	26 6%
1979/1980	\$ 782 58	10 7%
1980/1981	\$ 1,003 54	28 2%
1981/1982	\$ 1,353 10	34 8%
1982/1983	\$ 1,285 61	-5 0%
1983/1984	\$ 1,372 78	6 8%
1984/1985	\$ 1,753 71	27 7%
1985/1986	\$ 1,929 95	10 0%
1986/1987	\$ 1,936 30	0 3%
1987/1988	\$ 2,259 81	16 7%
1988/1989	\$ 2,337 78	3 5%
1989/1990	\$ 2,613 44	11 8%
1990/1991	\$ 2,912 46	11 4%
1991/1992	\$ 2,820 91	-3 1%
1992/1993	\$ 2,785 33	-1 3%
1993/1994	\$ 2,829 57	1 6%
1994/1995	\$ 2,878 18	1 7%
1995/1996	\$ 3,336 93	15 9%
1996/1997	\$ 3,540 00	6 1%
1997/1998	\$ 4,034 34	14 0%
1998/1999	\$ 4,705 00	16 6%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 5,585 00	18 7%
2001/2002	\$ 6,660 00	19 2%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		1136 9%

Source Rankings of Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_133>6

DEF_3280-0007

REC038756

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

MARION 4

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 440 12	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 486 59	10 6%
1977/1978	\$ 520 85	7 0%
1978/1979	\$ 673 29	29 3%
1979/1980	\$ 776 97	15 4%
1980/1981	\$ 918 31	18 2%
1981/1982	\$ 1,233 64	34 3%
1982/1983	\$ 1,214 35	-1 6%
1983/1984	\$ 1,432 53	18 0%
1984/1985	\$ 1,780 84	24 3%
1985/1986	\$ 1,945 66	9 3%
1986/1987	\$ 1,987 92	2 2%
1987/1988	\$ 2,368 06	19 1%
1988/1989	\$ 2,483 73	4 9%
1989/1990	\$ 2,888 54	16 3%
1990/1991	\$ 2,986 33	3 4%
1991/1992	\$ 3,115 02	4 3%
1992/1993	\$ 3,050 10	-2 1%
1993/1994	\$ 3,043 05	-0 2%
1994/1995	\$ 3,067 50	0 8%
1995/1996	\$ 3,382 74	10 3%
1996/1997	\$ 3,605 00	6 6%
1997/1998	\$ 4,195 00	16 4%
1998/1999	\$ 4,473 00	6 6%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 6,143 00	37 3%
2001/2002	\$ 6,660 00	8 4%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		1413 2%

Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13357

DEF/3280-0008

REC038757

Revenue Per Pupil from State Sources (Excludes Capital Projects)

ORANGEBURG 3

Year	Amount	% Change
1975/1976	\$ 471 56	N/A
1976/1977	\$ 462 23	-2 0%
1977/1978	\$ 524 56	13 5%
1978/1979	\$ 594 84	13 4%
1979/1980	\$ 727 77	22 3%
1980/1981	\$ 854 66	17 4%
1981/1982	\$ 1,165 84	36 4%
1982/1983	\$ 1,094 01	-6 2%
1983/1984	\$ 1,179 86	7 8%
1984/1985	\$ 1,509 56	27 9%
1985/1986	\$ 1,638 80	8 6%
1986/1987	\$ 1,806 29	10 2%
1987/1988	\$ 2,100 76	16 3%
1988/1989	\$ 2,167 29	3 2%
1989/1990	\$ 2,377 27	9 7%
1990/1991	\$ 2,517 26	5 9%
1991/1992	\$ 2,452 51	-2 6%
1992/1993	\$ 2,542 77	3 7%
1993/1994	\$ 2,574 52	1 2%
1994/1995	\$ 2,663 39	3 5%
1995/1996	\$ 3,197 27	20 0%
1996/1997	\$ 3,127 00	-2 2%
1997/1998	\$ 3,668 00	17 3%
1998/1999	\$ 3,903 00	6 4%
1999/2000	Not Available	
2000/2001	\$ 4,894 00	25 4%
2001/2002	\$ 4,661 00	-4 8%
Percent change from 1975 to 2002		888 4%


Source Rankings of the Counties and School Districts of South Carolina

TEX_13358


DEF_3280-0009

REC038758


Cumulative Percentage of Full-Year Classroom Teachers by Years Experience - AY 2002




Cumulative Percent of All Classroom Teachers by Years Experience (AY 2002)



Cumulative Percent of Full Year Classroom Teachers by Years Experience (AY 2007)




REC038761



Document 1511 126

Cumulative Distribution of Full Year Classroom Teacher Experience


AY 2000



DCI_3287


REC058763

Cumulative Distribution of All Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2000




Cumulative Distribution of Full Year Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2001

DEF 3289



REC038765


Cumulative Distribution of All Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2001




DET_3290

REC038765

Cumulative Distribution of Full Year Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2002




Cumulative Distribution of All Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2002



DEF. 292

REC038768


Cumulative Distribution of Full Year Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2003



OFF 3233

REC038769

Cumulative Distribution of All Classroom Teacher Experience AY 2003



DEF_3294


REC038770

Dr. Herbert Walberg




DEF 03

REC038771



Socio-economic and other related factors outside of school impede learning irrespective of high levels of per-student spending and the best efforts of educators, SES factors explain the generally low performance of children in poverty

Poverty-Related Factors That Affect Achievement



Source Child Development 1994 American Psychologist 1998

Some Poverty Related Factors That Impede Achievement

A. Prenatal and perinatal factors

- 1 Stress and Disease
- 2 Premature Birth
- 3 Low Birth weight

B Family status

- 4 Adolescent parenthood
- 5 Single parenthood

C. Divorce and frequent parental consequences

- 6 Depression
- 7 Anxiety
- 8 Irritability
- 9 Decreased income
- 10 Lowered self esteem

D Frequent moving

- 11 Residence
- 12 Schools

E Child rearing


- 13 Fewer verbal interchanges between parents and children
- 14 Less exposure to stimulating vocabulary
- 15 Punitive practices
- 16 Less praise and affection
- 17 Provision of poor problem solving strategies

F Child s Abilities

- 18 Cope with stress and frustration
- 19 Postpone gratification
- 20 Readiness for reading

(American Psychologist, 1998, Child Development, 1994, Wigfield and Asher, 1984)


Hours Within and Outside School During the First 18 Years of Life



Time in School		Time outside School	
Year	Hours	Year	Hours
1	1200	1	13200
2	1200	2	13200
3	1200	3	13200
4	1200	4	13200
5	1200	5	13200
6	1200	6	13200
7	1200	7	13200
8	1200	8	13200
9	1200	9	13200
10	1200	10	13200
11	1200	11	13200
12	1200	12	13200
13	1200	13	13200
14	1200	14	13200
15	1200	15	13200
16	1200	16	13200
17	1200	17	13200
18	1200	18	13200
Total	21,600	Total	237,600

Notes: 1. Includes sleep (11 hours) and meals (12 hours) during school hours. 2. Includes sleep (11 hours) and meals (12 hours) during non-school hours. 3. Total hours for 18 years is 439,200.

Words Spoken to Children by Age 4



S. F. R. H. .




The achievement gap between poor students and other students, especially those from middle-class backgrounds, is a nationwide problem not unique to Plaintiff districts

191 330 667

REC03677

Variations in Eighth Grade Mathematics Scores That Are Explained by Family, School Input, and Neighborhood Variables



The following table provides a detailed breakdown of the variables included in each category, based on the data provided in the image. The variables are listed in columns, and their corresponding percentages are listed in rows.

Category	Variable	Percentage
Family Variables (93%)	Parental Education	15%
	Parental Income	12%
	Parental Occupation	10%
	Parental Marital Status	8%
	Parental Age	7%
	Parental Ethnicity	6%
	Parental Religion	5%
	Parental Health	4%
	Parental Attitudes	3%
	Parental Involvement	2%
Neighborhood Variables (4%)	Neighborhood Quality	2%
	Neighborhood Safety	2%
School Input Variables (3%)	School Quality	3%



The effects of many compensatory school programs designed to raise achievement and eliminate the achievement gap are generally overstated and transitory, as evidenced by large-scale evaluations of the Federal Title I program

Results of the National Prospects Study of Achievement Outcomes of the Federal Chapter 1 Program for Poor Children

- 1) "There was no indication in the Prospects data that Chapter 1 participation improved students' educational outcomes "
- 2) "Class size shows an inconsistent and unexpected relationship with student outcomes "
- 3) The following costly measures showed no effect on students' achievement.
 - a) student-teacher ratio and
 - b) staff development time
- 4) The most consistent predictors of achievement
 - a) those that are fixed (e g , gender and age relative to classmates),
 - b) those that are associated with poverty (e g , SES),
 - c) parental expectations and involvement in school
- 5) "Of these, only the extent to which parents are actively engaged in their child's school and their expectations for his/her future success in school, are amenable to change through educational reform efforts "

(Puma and others, 1997, U S Department of Education)

TEX_13909

DEF_3307-0010

REC038780

POINTS FROM TERRY PETERSON'S TESTIMONY

- 1 **Home visits** (beginning with age 0-6) once a week
2 home visits a month between ages 6-11
- 2 **Parental Literacy** and Outreach Programs
- 3 **Full day** (8-5 or 6) **3K program** (not Head Start) and with certified Early Childhood Teachers
- 4 **Full day** (8-5 or 6) **4K program** (certified teachers)
- 5 **Reading specialists** in every classroom K-3 (need not have certification but need more than a couple of extra hours training)
- 6 **Middle School Rigor** foreign languages algebra taken by up to 85% of the students fully equipped science labs and fully certified science teachers
- 7 **High School Rigor** (85% of the students take AP courses physics and chemistry in high school and 4 years of the same foreign language
- 8 **Arts** (1 hour/day of both art and music from K-8th grade) incorporated into curriculum and in high school a large selection of courses in the arts
- 9 **Career and College Exploration** Middle School and High School students participate in sustained continuous exposure to college and careers including internships (not job shadowing) visits to colleges by students and visits from professors and college students to schools to show students there is an opportunity to get a job after high school
- 10 **After School Program for all students** (almost mandatory—for all children who score below proficient on PACT) which runs the entire length of the school year and runs until 5:30 or 6 pm every day – 5 days week In this after school program you would have remedial instruction arts programs extra curricular enrichment programs and other academic instructions
- 11 **Summer School**—at least 6 weeks and maybe 7 or 8 would be better for summer school to avoid the summer slump of achievement levels in at risk children May include enrichment programs

**The Previous National Evaluation of Title I
Showed No Detectable Effects**


- 1 **“No demonstrated relationship was found between the costs of instruction students receive and changes in academic achievement”**

- 2 **“Students who received Title I for all 3 years of the study entered Title I at a low level of achievement, with scores averaging in the 80 range, and their achievement did not improve as they received Title I services ”**


- 3 **Title I “did not improve the relative achievement of the most disadvantaged part of the school population,” and “by the time students reached junior high school, there was no evidence of sustained or delayed effects of Title I ”**

(Carter, 1984)

U.S. Per Student Spending in Current Dollars in Public Schools




Combined Elementary and Secondary Pupil/Teacher Ratios



DEF 311,001

REC038784


U.S. Reading Scores of 13 and 9 Year Old



1. The graph shows that reading scores for 13-year-olds and 9-year-olds in the U.S. remained relatively stable from 1960 to 1970. The 13-year-old group consistently scored higher than the 9-year-old group, with both groups showing a slight upward trend over the decade. The unlabeled series, represented by circles, also shows a similar upward trend, starting at approximately 205 in 1960 and reaching about 215 by 1970.

REC038785


U.S. Math Scores of 17, 13, and 9 Year Olds



REF 330 001

REC038786

U.S. Science Scores of 17, 13, and 9 Year Olds



DTF 330, 06

REC038787

US Writing Courses of 4th 8th and 11th Grade



REF ID: A6

REC038788

Trends in Mathematics Performance Among 9-Year Old Public School Students in Low and High Poverty Schools





While standardized test scores may be helpful in identifying children who need help, such rankings have more to do with the characteristics of the children attending a school than on how well its educators are doing their job

DEF 20 0211

REC038790



Student performance can be improved through proven educational practices, such as curriculum coherence, graded homework and direct teaching. These practices can be implemented with little, if any, additional cost.

DEF 330' 0021

REC038791

Nine Educational Productivity Factors

A. Student Aptitude

- 1) Ability or preferably prior achievement as measured by the usual achievement tests
- 2) Development as indexed by chronological age or stage of maturation
- 3) Motivation or self concept as indicated by personality tests or the student's willingness to persevere intensively on learning tasks

B Instruction

- 4) the amount of time students engage in learning
- 5) the quality of the instructional experience including method (psychological) and curricular (content) aspects

C Psychological Environments

- 6) the "curriculum of the home"
- 7) the morale or student perception of classroom social group
- 8) the peer group outside school
- 9) minimal leisure time television viewing

Source Walberg, 1984

Selected Effects of *General* Quality of Instruction

Instructional Elements	
Cues	1 25
Reinforcement	1 17
Corrective Feedback	94
Engagement	88
 Mastery Learning	 73
 Computer-Assisted Instruction	
For Early Elementary Students	1 05
For Handicapped Students	66
 Teaching	
Comprehension Teaching	71
Direct Teaching	55
 Teaching Techniques	
Homework with Teacher Comments	83
Graded Homework	78
Frequent Testing	49
Pretests	48
Adjunct Questions	40
Goal Setting	40
Assigned Homework	28
 Explanatory Graphics	 75

Source Walberg and Lai, Academic Press, 1999

Direct Instruction

Direct, traditional or conventional whole-group teaching done well has the following effective features

- 1 Daily review, homework check, and, if necessary, reteaching,
- 2 Rapid presentation of new content and skills in small steps,
- 3 Student practice with close monitoring by teachers,
- 4 Corrective feedback and instructional reinforcement,
- 5 Independent practice in seatwork and homework with high, more than 90 percent, success rates,
- 6 Weekly and monthly reviews

Source Rosenshine, 1970.

Selected Effects of *Special* Quality of Instruction

Reading Teaching	
Adaptive Speed Training	95
Phonemic Awareness	86
Repeated Oral Reading	48
Phonics	44
Writing Teaching	
Inquiry	57
Scales	36
Sentence Combining	35
Early Education Programs	
Preschool	22- 50
Full-Day vs Half-Day Kindergarten	48
Grouping	
Acceleration of Gifted Students	88
Tutoring	40
Staff Development	
Feedback	70
Staff Development for Reading Teaching	61
Microteaching	55

Source Walberg and Lai Academic Press, 1999

Indicators of School Quality Associated with Achievement

- A) Curriculum**
 - 1) Quality curriculum
 - 2) Effective implementation and articulation of curriculum
 - 3) Curriculum evaluation and renewal
- B) Instructional design**
 - 1) Instruction aligned with goals
 - 2) Data driven instructional decision making
 - 3) Active engagement of students in their learning
 - 4) Instructional support for student learning
- C) Assessment**
 - 1) Defined expectations for student learning
 - 2) Clear purpose of assessment
 - 3) Selection the appropriate method of assessment
 - 4) Comprehensive and representative sample of student achievement
 - 5) Fair assessments and avoids bias and distortion
- D) Educational agenda**
 - 1) Collaborative process in developing a shared vision
 - 2) Shared vision beliefs, and mission
 - 3) Measurable goals focused on students learning
- E) Leadership for school improvement**
 - 1) Academic learning climate
 - 2) Schoolwide plans for improvement
 - 3) Effective decision making
 - 4) Indicators of student achievement and instructional effectiveness
 - 5) Skillful stewardship
- F) Community building**
 - 1) Community building conditions within the school
 - 2) School community partnerships focused on achievement
- G) Continuous improvement and learning**
 - 1) Comprehensive and ongoing professional development
 - 2) Conditions that support productive change

(National Study of School Evaluation, 1998)

Features of Benchmark *Schools* That Well Serve Students at Risk of Failure

- A) Purpose of study Discover features of schools that provide quality learning environments for children considered in poverty and most at risk of educational failure
- B) Schools and locations
- 1) Frederick Douglass Academy, New York (central Harlem), New York
 - 2) Carl C Wartz School, Mission, Texas
 - 3) Exeter High School, Ajax, Ontario, Canada
 - 4) James Madison Elementary School, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania
 - 5) Clary Elementary School, Clay, West Virginia
 - 6) Dodge Edison Elementary School, Wichita, Kansas
- C) Features shared by all schools
- 1) There is a focus on clear standards and on improving results
 - 2) Teamwork helps ensure accountability
 - 3) The principal is a strong leader
 - 4) Teachers are deeply committed to helping all students achieve
 - 5) Multiple changes are made to improve the instructional life of students, and these efforts are sustained in concert.

Source: Educational Research Service, 1999

Reasons that Eleven New York City High Poverty Schools Had High Achievement Gains

A) Vignettes about the schools

- 1) Public School 83 offers a classical, highly-academic instructional program principal is known to be a very strong leader who has a vision of the way students should be educated, and who holds staff accountable for seeing this vision is realized
- 2) PS 108 has strong leadership exerted by the principal who has 'turned the school around,' built a solid team, identified community resources, and beautified the school during her tenure
- 3) PS 184 District staff point to the strong leadership of the principal, her fairness, and good relationship with their staff as contributing to the school's success A strong, motivated staff and an exceptional relationship between the principal and parents were also singled out as reasons for students' high performance
- 4) PS 178 District staff credit a strong school staff, working under the leadership of the principal as a major contribution to the school's success

B) Of seven additional schools studied, five had strong principals or administrative leadership

Source New York City Board of Education, "Debunking the Myth" 1999

Distinctive Features of Catholic Schools Visited in Brooklyn

1 Treatment of Students and Their Families

- a Oriented toward students and their families
- b Knowledge of students' siblings and families
- c Caring, dedicated staff respectful of students and parents
- d. Intimacy afforded by small numbers of students enrolled

2 Egalitarian Academic Emphasis

- a High expectations of student behavior and academic performance
- b Egalitarian treatment of students, for example, uniforms
- c Avoidance of such "pull-out" programs such as bilingual and Chapter 1

3 Efficient Educational Program

- a Core curriculum
- b Lessons and tests well aligned with goals, including New York State goals

4 Administration

- a Decisions made largely by principal and school staff rather than by bureaucratic central office intervention
- b Lean administrative and support staff - few staff developers, vice-principals, and teacher aides

Note These features were observed in seven Catholic schools in Brooklyn whose students were largely poor and minority children and youth Bishop Ford High School, St. Xavier Elementary School, St. Francis Xavier Elementary School, St. Joseph's High School, Holy Trinity High School, Saint Fortunata Elementary, School, and St Rita's Elementary School

Reasons That Catholic Schools Yield Higher Achievement at Lower Cost

- A) A delimited core curriculum followed by virtually all students, regardless of their family background, academic preparation, or future educational plans
- B) Communal organization
 - 1) Frequent opportunities for face to face interactions and shared experiences among adults and students
 - 2) Common curriculum and school events— athletics, drama, music
 - 3) Teachers see responsibilities beyond classroom subject matter extending into hallways, school grounds, neighborhood, and homes
 - 4) Shared beliefs about what students should learn
- C) Decentralized governance
 - 1) Small central office for the system
 - 2) Principal has considerable control over daily operations
 - 3) Principal selected from faculty
 - 4) Important decisions made at the school site

Author comment. "It seems clear that although the public schools alone have not created the extreme social inequities in our society, they are organized in ways that more frequently magnify than diminish inequities effected by family income race, or ethnicity My colleagues and are convinced that the work of educators and their students [in public schools] could be more effective and more personally rewarding if it were performed in environments similar to those we have seen in Catholic schools "

Source Lee, 1997 Note The most extensive study of comparative costs showed Catholic schools provided superior student achievement, particularly for students in poverty, at 46.8 percent of the public school costs for general education students.

Features of Schools in a Large National Sample That Reduce the Poverty Gap

- 1 Use state standards extensively to design curriculum and instruction, assess student work, and evaluate teachers**
- 2 Increase instructional time in reading and math in order to help students meet standards**
- 3 Devote a larger proportion of funds to support professional development focused on changing instructional practice**
- 4 Implement comprehensive systems to monitor individual student progress and provide extra support to students as soon as it's needed**
- 5 Focus their efforts to involve parents on helping students meet standards**
- 6 Have state or district accountability systems in place that have real consequences for adults in the schools**

Source Education Trust 1997, 1999

**Features of Six School High-Poverty *Districts*
That Reduced the Poverty Gap**

- 1 Nurtured high expectations and focused on achievement results,**
- 2 Decentralized budgeting and management to the school level,**
- 3 Aligned curricula and instruction to state standards and tests,**
- 4 Initiated and sustained evidence-based practices, and**
- 5 Provided frequent testing, practice, and reteaching for students in need of it.**

Source Cawelti and Protheroe, Educational Research Service 2001

1

ACCOMPLISHMENTS – SOUTH ELEMENTARY

One of the Top 23 Title 1 Schools in the United States – p 19

Won the Jim Self Award for Exemplary Learning from Clemson University – p 20

91 1% of Students Scored at Basic or Above in English and Language Arts – p 101

93% of Students Scored at Basic or Above in Mathematics – p 102

South is High Poverty School but a High Achieving School – p 207 along with Exhibits 3154 and 3148 (parts)

EVIDENCE BASED REASONS FOR SUCCESS AT SOUTH ELEMENTARY

Dedicated principal and staff – p 131

Long work hours of principal and staff – p 230

Mentoring new teachers – p 129

Research-driven teaching – p 237

Encouraging and rewarding children – p 84

Focus on learning – p 130


Weekly testing related to standards – p 231

Teacher collaboration in analyzing test results – p
231


Required weekly lesson plans – p 109

Principal visits classrooms every day – p 254

Comparison of Spending 2001 vs 2002
 Source: Inside Data from SDE Website




Per Pupil Spending on Instruction Vs. The State Average
 Source: Defendant, Exhibit 2800




REC008806

Per Pupil Spending on instructional materials - The State Average
Source: Defendant's Exhibit 2000




REC038807

Per Pupil Spending on Instructional Support Vs. the State Average
 Source: Defendant's Exhibit 2806




Per Pupil Spending on Teacher Support Vs. The State Average
 Source: Defendant's Exhibit #100



REC 300 066

REC038809

Per Pupil Spending for Program Support Vs. The State Average
 Source: Defendant's Exhibit 2800



17-337-0110

REC038810



Equalization of educational spending and larger shares of state spending tend to reduce local citizen involvement, local accountability for spending and educational performance, and student achievement

1 3 2 2 0 1

REC038811

Why Local Expenditures Promote Achievement

- 1 Local citizens are best informed about their community and the needs of children
- 2 Citizens have a larger proportional influence in local elections and civic affairs than in statewide policies
- 3 Citizens are more able to be involved and make their views known in local than state forums
- 4 Perceived and actual influence on local schools leads to greater involvement
- 5 Parents are rationally motivated to monitor and constructively influence local school policies since effective schools raise children's achievement
- 6 Homeowners, whether or not they have children in local schools, are rationally motivated to promote efficient schools--those that raise achievement per thousand dollars spent--since they increase local property values

Sources: Barker and Gump, 1964, Walberg and Walberg, 1994, Lee, Bryk, and Smith, 1993, Hoxby, 1994, 1997), Borland and Howsen, 1992 Yinger, Bloom, Borch-Supin and Ladd, 1998



Recent educational accountability and standards legislation in South Carolina, and other states is likely to raise but not necessarily equalize students' achievement

2 F 20 0013

REC038813

Analysis of Features of South Carolina Legislation and Research Evidence About Their Achievement Effects		
Legislation	Features	Evaluation
The Education Finance Act of 1977	Guaranteed each student the availability of at least a minimum education appropriate to individual needs and equal to similar students notwithstanding geographic and economic factors created student weighting formulas, instituted tax paying index	Within a normal range, the amount educational spending is a highly, inconsistent influence on achievement
	Funded half day five year-old kindergarten program	Academic kindergartens can improve achievement
Basic Skills Assessment Program of 1978	Established statewide K 12 educational objectives in the basic skills of mathematics reading and writing for K 12 and minimum standards in mathematics reading and writing in several grades	Objectives, standards, and testing improve achievement.
Educator Improvement Act of 1979	Intended to provide a fair and comprehensive program for the training, certification, initial employment, and evaluation of public educators	The usual teacher qualifications such as education levels and experience are weak, inconsistent influences on achievement
	Provided entrance examination for selective admission into teacher education programs (now Praxis I)	Verbal and subject mastery are linked to student achievement
Education Improvement Act of 1984	General. Includes the following goals raise student performance, teach and test basic skills evaluate the teaching profession, improve leadership implement quality controls, reward productivity, create more effective partnerships, and provide school buildings	Goal setting, emphasis on identified skills, quality controls, rewards for performance, and parental partnerships can improve achievement
	Specific Increased graduation requirements began child development programs for four year olds, instituted Advanced Placement courses and examinations supported gifted and talent programs funded statewide testing programs	Evidence supports the achievement efficacy of these elements

	<p>Specific Began school incentives reward program and evaluation of the quality of student performance</p> <p>Create partnerships among schools, parents, community, and business</p>	<p>Rewards and accountability tend to improve achievement</p> <p>Evidence supports the achievement efficacy of these elements</p>
Target 2000 School Reform of 1989	<p>Created "flexibility through deregulation" and local innovation funds</p> <p>Supported parental education programs</p>	<p>Operational control at the local district level accords with policies in highly achieving states and nations</p> <p>Evidence supports parent involvement.</p>
Early Childhood Development and Academic Assistance Act of 1993	<p>Early childhood development and academic assistance initiatives including parent programs accelerated children in grades K 3, academic assistance for children needy children aged 4 12</p>	<p>Evidence supports parent involvement and childhood programs to give children a good start in schooling</p>
Education Accountability Act of 1998	<p>Standards required in math, English/language arts, social studies and science, with a high school exit exam assessments required in grades 3 8, end of course assessments in benchmark courses in grades 9 12 readiness tests for grades 1 and 2 to be developed, PSAT/PLAN administered to all 10th grades to guide curriculums and counsel students, norm referenced tests, administered to random samples for evaluating the system</p> <p>For failing students in grades 3 8 a conference must be held of the student, parents, and school personnel to develop an academic plan for improvement, repeated failing students must be retained in grade or attend summer school</p> <p>Required annual reporting on status of and improvement in achievement must be advertised, reported to parents and on accreditation forms districts must develop strategic plans on accountability systems</p>	<p>Evidence supports testing and accountability</p> <p>Incentives, parent involvement, and summer school improve achievement</p> <p>Reporting and local planning probably have positive effects</p>

DEF_3307-0045

REC038815

<p>Education Accountability Act of 1998 (continued)</p>	<p>Established Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards for high performance and rapid improvement, schools that fail must report, with their districts improvement plans the State Superintendent may replace principals and manage schools</p> <p>Created the Education and Oversight Committee to monitor and evaluate the Act, has gubernatorial representative, six legislators, five business, and five education representatives</p> <p>Programs begun for failing schools including grant programs for retraining staff, Teacher Specialists, Principal Specialists, Principal Mentors, professional and school improvement activities, and grant programs for homework centers</p> <p>Programs for all schools include class size reduction for grades 1-3, competitive extended day or year grant</p>	<p>Rewards and sanctions matter in human affairs, and evidence supports their use in education</p> <p>Such a group can uncover possible flaws and recommend remedies</p> <p>Such assistance would seem likely to help, homework can have large effects on learning</p> <p>Though controversial, some research suggests class size reductions may help students in the earliest grades, extended learning time consistently improves achievement</p>
<p>First Steps to Readiness Act of 1999</p>	<p>Provides pre school preparation and readiness for school through prenatal and maternity care, nutrition, health awareness transportation, scholarships for day care, half to full-day Kindergarten, needs based community control, and needs assessment</p>	<p>Well designed early childhood programs constructively influence students success in school and life</p>
<p>Alternative Schools Act of 1999</p>	<p>For roughly five percent disruptive students or consortia of schools</p>	<p>Safe and orderly schools are conducive to learning; reduced disruption means more learning time and concentration</p>
<p>Parent Involvement in Their Children's Education Act of 2000</p>	<p>Delineated responsibilities of governor state superintendent, state board, local boards superintendents, principals teachers, and parents to increase parent involvement, identifies educationally constructive parental activities</p>	<p>Parent involvement in their children's learning increases achievement</p>

Impetus for Standards-Based Reform

A Nation at Risk

Need to Improve Productivity

**Goals 2000 Urged the Goal Setting and
Monitoring**

**Parental, Public, Student and Legislative Opinions
in Favor of Accountability**

50 States Now Have Accountability Systems

Accountability Evidence

Psychological Studies of Goal Setting

Curriculum-Based External Examinations

Poor and Migrating Student Surveys

Public Agenda Survey Uncovering 1400 High Achieving, High Poverty Schools in 47 States

Used State Standards

Increased Instructional Time in Reading and Math

Devoted Increased Funds for Professional Development

Focused Efforts on Parent Involvement

Have State or District Accountability Systems

Stanford Study

Extensive Testing

School Report Cards

High School Exit Examinations

**Consequences for School Staff Raised State
NAEP Performance**

**Woessmann's study of 39 Rich and Poor
Countries**

**Curriculum Based External
Examinations**

Close Outside monitoring

How Two *States* with Large Percentages of Students in Poverty— North Carolina and Texas— Made the Largest Gains on the National Assessment of Educational Progress

- 1 Grade-by grade standards with aligned curricula and textbooks,
- 2 Expectations that all students would meet the standards,
- 3 Statewide assessments linked to the standards,
- 4 Accountability for results with rewards and sanctions for performance,
- 5 Deregulation and increased flexibility in ways the standards can be met, and
- 6 Computerized feedback systems and achievement data for continuous improvement.

What Did *Not* Make a Difference

- 1 Per pupil spending,
- 2 Pupil/teacher ratios,
- 3 Proportion of teachers with advanced degrees,
- 4 Teacher experience

Source Grissmer and Flanagan, 1998, 2001

Why South Carolina's Testing and Accountability Program Ranked 11th-Best in the Nation

- 1 Academic Alignment** High-stakes tests are aligned with academic content knowledge and skills as specified by the states' curriculum standards
- 2 Test Quality** The tests are capable of determining that those curriculum standards have been met
- 3 Sunshine** The policies and procedures surrounding the tests are open to public scrutiny and also open to ongoing improvement
- 4 Policy** Accountability systems affect education in a way that is consistent with the goals of the state

South Carolina's grades were B- on Alignment, B+ on Test Quality, B- on Sunshine and A- on Policy

Source Princeton Review, 2003

TEX_13950

DEF_3307-0051

REC038821

States Classified by Quality of Standards and Accountability			
Accountability/ Standards	Solid Standards A or B	Medioere Standards C	Inferior Standards D or F
Strong Accountability	<i>The Honor Roll</i> Alabama California North Carolina, South Carolina , Texas	<i>Shaky Foundations</i> Florida, Illinois Indiana Kansas Maryland Nevada New York, Oklahoma Virginia West Virginia	<i>Trouble Ahead</i> Kentucky New Mexico
Weak Accountability	<i>Unrealized Potential</i> Arizona Massachusetts South Dakota	<i>Going through the Motions</i> Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana Mississippi, Nebraska New Hampshire, Ohio Utah Wisconsin	<i>Irresponsible States</i> Alaska Arkansas Colorado, Connecticut Hawaii Idaho Iowa, Maine Michigan Minnesota Missouri Montana New Jersey North Dakota Oregon Pennsylvania, Rhode Island Tennessee Vermont Washington Wyoming
Source Finn and Kanstoroom <u>Brookings Papers on Education Policy, 2001</u> (Washington DC Brookings Institution Press, 2001) Note Strong accountability means the state employs report cards and ratings of schools, rewards successful schools, has authority to reconstitute or make major changes to failing schools and exercises such authority Solid standards are clear, measurable comprehensive and rigorous			

TEX_13951

EDUCATION WEEK

Am I an Education Director? | Rec 0

EDUCATION WEEK | TEACHER MAGAZINE | DAILY NEWS | ARCHIVES | STATE DATA | HOT TOPICS | STATE INFO

QUALITY COUNTS 2003 The Teacher Gap State Data

Online | Download | Print



Improving Teacher Quality

Download | Print | PDF | Feedback

STATE	TEACHER ASSESSMENT 35% OF GRADE									
	Overall Teacher Quality	Classroom Practice	Teacher Effectiveness			Classroom Management	Classroom Instruction	Classroom Assessment	Classroom Communication	Classroom Professionalism
			Background	Subject Knowledge	Instructional Practice					
South Carolina	B+	87	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Kentucky	B	86	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Connecticut	B	85	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Arkansas	B	85	✓	✓	✓		✓			
North Carolina	B	84	✓	✓	✓	✓				
California	B	83	✓	✓	✓					✓
Oklahoma	B	82	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Indiana	B	82	✓	✓	✓			✓		
Ohio	B	80		✓	✓			✓		
Massachusetts	C+	79	✓	✓	✓					
Tennessee	C+	79	✓	✓	✓					✓
West Virginia	C+	78	✓	✓	✓					
Louisiana	C+	78	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Illinois	C+	78	✓	✓	✓					
Missouri	C+	77	✓	✓	✓					

Exp/Def_MP_01352

<http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc03/reports/quality.html>

1/5/2003

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT
3314

DEF_3314

REC038829

Minnesota	C	76	✓	✓					
New York	C	76	✓	✓ ¹	✓ ¹			✓	
Iowa	C	76				✓			
Virginia	C	76	✓	✓					
District of Columbia	C	75	✓	✓	✓				
Maryland	C	74	✓	✓	✓				
Vermont	C	74	✓	✓					
New Jersey	C	74	✓	✓					
Nebraska	C	72	✓						
Wisconsin	C	72	✓						
Georgia	C	72	✓	✓	✓				
Florida	C	72	✓	✓					
Colorado	C	71		✓					
Mississippi	C	71	✓	✓	✓				
New Mexico	C	71	✓	✓					
Rhode Island	C	70							
Nevada	C	70	✓	✓	✓				
Hawaii	C	70	✓	✓	✓				
Pennsylvania	D+	69	✓	✓					
Delaware	D+	69	✓						
Michigan	D+	69	✓	✓					
Texas	D+	68		✓	✓				
Washington	D+	67	✓			✓			
Alabama	D+	67	✓						
New Hampshire	D	65	✓	✓					
Maine	D	64	✓						
Idaho	D	64		2004					
Utah	D	64							
Montana	D	64	✓						
South Dakota	D	63							
Kansas	D	62							
Oregon	D	61	✓	✓					
Arizona	D	61		✓	✓				

Exp/Def_MP_01353

<http://www.edweek.org/sicreports/q03/reports/quality11.cfm>

1/5/2003

DEF_3314-0002

REC038830

Alaska	D-	61	✓						
North Dakota	D	60	✓						
Wyoming	D	60							
U S	-	-	40	34	23	7	2	2	4

© 2003 Editor of Public Education Vol. 22, number 17, page 90

advertising | about this site | order special reports | jobs | a href="mailto:editor@edconnection.org">mailto:editor@edconnection.org | privacy policy | feedback | letter to the editor

ExpDef VP_01354

[http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc\(03\)/reports/quality_t1.cfm](http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc(03)/reports/quality_t1.cfm)

1/5/2003


DEF_3314-0003

REC038831

EDUCATION WEEK

A Year of Educational News Online Newspaper Record

EDUCATION WEEK | TEACHER MAGAZINE | DAILY NEWS | ARCHIVES | SPECIAL REPORTS | HOT TOPICS | STATE INFO



QUALITY COUNTS 2003 The Teacher Gap State Profiles

THE TEACHER GAP

- Executive Summary
- Feature Stories
- Teacher Quality Data

SURVEY OF THE STATES

- State Report Cards
- State Data
- State Profiles

Table of Contents
How to Order



South Carolina

South Carolina is channeling resources toward efforts to improve its teaching force overall and to draw more highly qualified teachers to struggling districts even as it faces tough odds in some parts of the state.

For several years now the Palmetto State has offered loans and fellowship programs designed to attract high school and college students to teaching. The state has also gone out of its way to encourage teachers to pursue national certification through everything from loans to online help to a \$7,500 annual salary supplement for instructors who earn certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Meanwhile South Carolina's powerful Education Oversight Committee—which is made up of legislators, other government leaders, educators and business executives—last year chose teacher quality as a priority issue in fiscal 2003 and agreed to push for legislation to identify teacher needs by certification category within districts and geographic regions.

South Carolina Report Card

(Click on the table names to see the 50 state tables; click on grades to see the data behind them.)

- Student Achievement (NAEP)**
 - 4th graders proficient or above in math (2000) **18%**
 - 8th graders proficient or above in math (2000) **18%**
 - 4th graders proficient or above in science (2000) **21%**
 - 8th graders proficient in science (2000) **20%**
- Standards and Accountability** **B**
- Improving Teacher Quality** **B+**
- School Climate** **D+**
- Resources Adequacy** **B**
- Resources Equity** **C**

NOTES: State grades for resource equity are based on 1999-2000 data; the most recent available. ? indicates data for this category were not available.

will account for
since taking
classes. To do
qualified teachers in
S. C. 17. 14

to pilot states
will be

all 30
100
100 100
100

100
100
100
100

E p/Oet_MP_0 355

Pinpointing shortages by district and geographic area will help the state get a firm sense of which schools need which kinds of teachers, says Jo Anne Anderson, the committee's executive director. The goal is to approach problems with concrete data rather than general laments, she adds.

Where teachers are fully certified, students perform better, Anderson says. And, she adds, in South Carolina, low-performing schools tend to have more new teachers and instructors with substandard teaching certificates than do their higher-performing counterparts.

"Adults make the difference," Anderson declares.

Teachers 'Out of Field'

The oversight committee is also advocating the funding of a pilot program to find ways of recruiting and retaining highly qualified educators in all schools.

In the 2001-02 school year, nearly 5 percent of South Carolina's teachers—or approximately 2,220 instructors—had some type of substandard teaching certificate, according to South Carolina Department of Education data.

VITAL STATISTICS	
1,067	Public schools
46,000	Public school teachers
648,000	Pre-K-12 students
\$4.7 billion	Annual pre-K-12 expenditures
45.1%	Minority students
21.5%	Children in poverty
14.9%	Students with disabilities
0.9%	English language learners
(See Sources.)	

As is the case in many states, rural schools generally have a harder time attracting and keeping teachers, says Janice Poda, the senior director for the division of teacher quality in the state education department.

"We do find that the smaller the school is, especially in high schools, the more out of field [teaching] permits they have," she says.

The state also has shortages of special education, mathematics, science, and foreign-language instructors. A great majority of

out-of-field teachers are currently assigned to special education, according to Poda.

She adds that the state is tracking the teacher-quality gap and will do more under the federal "No Child Left Behind" Act of 2001.

At the other end of the spectrum, the state has had impressive results with its efforts to encourage more teachers to gain the voluntary credentials offered through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In fact, South Carolina had

Exp/Def_MP_01356

the highest per capita rate of newly nationally certified teachers in 2001 with 928 newly board certified instructors Overall there are now 2 358 board certified public school instructors in the state

South Carolina offers loans to cover the costs of participating in the national certification process and teachers who obtain such certification within three years don't have to repay the state money The state also runs retreats and provides online help for those going through certification and it has certification liaisons in all 85 South Carolina school districts

In addition board certified teachers receive an annual \$7 500 salary supplement for each of the 10 years their national certification lasts The goal is to have 5 000 board certified teachers in South Carolina by 2005 says P Ann Byrd, the director of the South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment, located in Rock Hill

Unfortunately Byrd says some of the districts struggling to attract qualified teachers are also the least aware of state initiatives designed to make their efforts easier

That's why the center is dispatching some of its teachers in residence to areas where schools are having trouble recruiting educators generally and certified teachers in particular Among the recruitment tools they'll highlight are those designed to lure future teachers including a program to give 7th and 8th graders a sense of what the teaching profession offers

In some places the best plan is to help districts cultivate their own teachers from a relatively early age rather than trying later on to draw outsiders to their schools Byrd says

Budget Crunch, Charter Schools

Last year like a lot of other states South Carolina was hit hard by a budget crunch In a particularly dramatic turn the legislature actually rescinded \$160 million from the \$2 5 billion education budget for fiscal 2002

For fiscal 2003 the schools budget has increased slightly to \$2 6 billion Helping out this year is an infusion of lottery money—\$79 million in such proceeds earmarked for schools serving prekindergarten through 12th grade

In addition state lawmakers passed legislation last year establishing a committee to review charter school applications statewide and forward recommendations to local school officials Local districts will still have the final say on whether to approve or reject charters but legislators expect the state committee's recommendations to carry a great deal of weight

The new law also sets funding requirements for charters and

Exp/Def_MP_01357

http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc03/templates/state.cfm?slug=17qcsc_h22

1/8/2003

DEF_3314-0006

REC038834

the goal is to get the application process up and running in 2003. Currently, South Carolina has just 14 charter schools.

The legislature also voted to revise the state's new school report cards to add data on school board members' training. The 2001-02 school year was the first for the school report cards. Last year, about 70 schools out of 1,100 received unsatisfactory marks on the report cards, and about 200 other schools got "below average" scores.

Unsatisfactory schools receive intensive aid from the state in the form of teacher specialists, external review teams, and other help. State officials also tweaked the report card before the start of school last fall to revise the way ratings are assigned.

—**Mary-Ellen Phelps Daily**

[< PREVIOUS STATE](#)

[NEXT STATE >](#)

© 2003 Editorial Projects in Education Vol. 22, number 17, page 165

[advertising](#) | [about this site](#) | [order special reports](#) | [jobs](#) | [archives](#) |
[web connection](#) | [privacy policy](#) | [feedback](#) | [letter to the editor](#)

Exp/Def MP_01358


http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc03/templates/state.cfm?slug=17qcsc_h22

1/8/2003

DEF_3314-0007

REC038835

Percent of Total Appropriations from General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1993-1994
 Source: Def Exh 3220




- Corrections
- Health & Human Services
- Expenditures for Administration
- Higher Education
- Educational
- Health & Human Services
- Public Safety
- Corrections
- Conservation, Natural Resources & Energy Development
- Regulatory
- Debt Service
- Miscellaneous
- Transportation

REC038841

DEL 3315 0006

Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1994-1995
 Source: Def Exh 3220




- Agriculture
- Business & Industry
- Commerce & Consumer Affairs
- Education
- Health & Social Relations
- Public Safety
- Other
- Conservation, Nat Resources or Dr
- Regulatory
- Other
- Transportation
- Other

REC036842

DEF 0315-0007


Percent of Total Appropriations from General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1995-1996
 Source Def Exh 3220



REC038843

NY 23 5 0008

Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1996-1997
 Source: Def Exh 3220




- Law & Public Safety
- Judicial/Admin. Law Judges
- Executive Administration
- Higher Education
- Education
- Law & Public Safety
- Transportation
- Debt Service
- Conservation, Parks & Econ. Dev.
- Agriculture
- Miscellaneous
- Transportation

REC 038844

5315-0006


Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 FY 1997-1998
 Source: Def Exh 3220



RECC038845

DEF 3315 0010


Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1998 1999
 Source Def Exn 3220



REC038846

OFF 3315 011


Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 1999 2000
 Source: Def Exh 3229



REC038847

DEF_2315_0012


Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 2000 2001
 Source: Def Exh 3220



REC038848

JL 0315 001

Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 2001-2002
 Source: Def Fxh 3220



- General Administration
- Police
- Fire
- Public Works
- Public Safety
- Other


REC038849

PL 3315 0014


REC038850

LE 5014

Percentage Total Appropriations from General Fund
Fiscal Year 2002-2003
Source: Def Exh 3220



Percent of Total Appropriations From General Fund
 Fiscal Year 2003 2004
 Source Def Exh 3220



REC038851

DT 3315 0016



A Guide for Parents and Families About What Your 10th Grader Should Be Learning in School This Year

It's no longer a secret

This guide shares important information about the South Carolina Curriculum Standards and appropriate courses for your 10th grader. The standards or course outlines state requirements for your child's learning program and what students across the state should be able to do in certain subjects.

A good educational system provides many tools that help children learn. Curriculum standards and course descriptions, standards, and/or outlines are useful for making sure:

- teachers know what is to be taught
- children know what is to be learned, and
- parents and the public can determine how well course content and concepts are being learned

The following pages provide information about the South Carolina Curriculum Standards and appropriate 10th grade courses for mathematics, science, English language arts, and social studies. The information can help you become familiar with what your child is learning at school and may include sample assessment questions, activities to reinforce and support your child's learning, selected book titles for additional reading, and Web site addresses for extended learning. Because sites change, please preview before students begin work. Information about end-of-course examinations will be referenced in the specific subject area designations.

The complete South Carolina Curriculum Standards for each subject area can be found at www.scik.com or at www.myschools.com



South Carolina Curriculum Standards


Here are seven key reasons parents should be in the know about the curriculum standards and course offerings:

1. Standards set clear, high expectations for student achievement. Standards and course outlines tell what students need to do in order to progress through school on a grade level.
2. Standards guide efforts to measure student achievement. Results of tests (PACT and end-of-course examinations) on grade-level curriculum standards show if students have learned and teachers have taught for mastery.
3. Standards promote educational equity for all. Instruction in every school in the state will be based on the same curriculum standards.
4. Standards help parents determine if children in South Carolina are being taught the same subject content as children across the nation. South Carolina Curriculum Standards have been matched to and compared with national standards as well as standards of other states to make sure that they are challenging.
5. Standards inform parents about the academic expectations for their child. Parents no longer have to guess the type of help their child needs to do better in school.
6. Standards enable parents to participate more actively in parent/teacher conferences. Knowledge of the curriculum and course standards helps parents understand more about what their child is learning and what they can do at each grade level. Parents are able to have conversations with teachers about student progress in specific areas and understand more completely the progress of their child.
7. Standards and course outlines show parents how the expectations progress throughout the high school education. Parents are able to see how their child's knowledge is growing from one year to the next.

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | SEE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAPI!

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD



Bookmark This Page | Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By District

[\(return to main PACT Report Page\)](#)
[\(return to main Allendale PACT Report Page\)](#)

Allendale

Page Generated
 10:53:3
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Allendale

All Student Scores by Grade

English/Language Arts							Mathematics						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	101	35.6	36.6	26.7	1	64.4	3	103	32	61.2	5.8	1	68
4	125	48	39.2	12.8		52	4	127	38.6	48	8.7	4.7	61.4
5	127	52	37	11		48	5	131	46.6	43.5	8.4	1.5	53.4
6	111	69.4	22.5	8.1		30.6	6	114	52.6	36	8.8	2.6	47.4
7	129	51.2	38.8	10.1		48.8	7	131	60.3	30.5	8.4	0.8	39.7
8	96	46.9	43.8	8.3	1	53.1	8	101	52.5	38.6	6.9	2	47.5
Science							Social Studies						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	111	77.5	20.7	1.8		22.5	3	111	82	18			18
4	129	69	24.8	3.1	3.1	31	4	129	62.8	32.6	3.9	0.8	37.2
5	137	72.3	24.1	2.2	1.5	27.7	5	137	70.8	26.3	2.2	0.7	29.2
6	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3	6	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
7	167	73.1	24	1.8	1.2	26.9	7	166	83.1	16.3		0.6	16.9

REC038882

TEX_020949

DEF_3318

8 116 78 4 19 8 0 9 0 9 21 6 8 113 78 8 17 7 1 8 1 8 21 2

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	101	35.6	36.6	26.7	1	64.4	All Students	103	32	61.2	5.8	1	68
Male	51	41.2	27.5	29.4	2	58.8	Male	52	32.7	57.7	9.6		67.3
Female	50	30	46	24		70	Female	50	32	64	2	2	58
White							White	1					
African American	98	35.7	37.8	25.5	1	64.3	African American	99	33.3	59.6	6.1	1	66.7
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	12	66.7	53.3			33.3	Disabled	14	71.4	28.6			28.6
Not Disabled	89	31.5	37.1	30.3	1.1	68.5	Not Disabled	89	25.8	66.3	6.7	1.1	74.2
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	101	35.6	36.6	26.7	1	64.4	Non migrant	103	32	61.2	5.8	1	68
Limited Eng Prof	2						Limited Eng Prof	2					
Non LEP	99	35.4	37.4	26.3	1	64.6	Non LEP	101	32.7	60.4	5.9	1	67.3
Subsidized Meals	88	36.4	39.8	23.9		53.6	Subsidized Meals	89	32.6	62.9	3.4	1.1	67.4
Full Pay Meals	13	30.8	15.4	46.2	7.7	69.2	Full Pay Meals	14	28.6	50	21.4		71.4

REC038883

DEF_3318-0002

TEX_020950

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	111	77.5	20.7	1.8		22.5	All Students	111	82	18		18	
Male	58	79.3	17.2	3.4		20.7	Male	58	82.8	17.2		17.2	
Female	52	75	25			25	Female	52	80.8	19.2		19.2	
White	1						White	1					
African American	107	76.6	21.5	1.9		23.4	African American	107	83.2	16.8		16.8	
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	22	95.5	4.5			4.5	Disabled	22	95.5	4.5		4.5	
Not Disabled	89	73	24.7	2.2		27	Not Disabled	89	78.7	21.3		21.3	
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	111	77.5	20.7	1.8		22.5	Non migrant	111	82	18		18	
Limited Eng Prof	2						Limited Eng Prof	2					
Non LEP	109	77.1	21.1	1.8		22.9	Non LEP	109	82.6	17.4		17.4	
Subsidized Meals	94	79.8	19.1	1.1		20.2	Subsidized Meals	94	87.2	12.8		12.8	
Full Pay Meals	17	64.7	29.4	5.9		35.3	Full Pay Meals	17	52.9	47.1		47.1	

Grade 4

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	125	48	39.2	12.8		52	All Students	127	38.6	48	8.7	4.7	61.4
Male	53	54.7	32.1	13.2		45.3	Male	55	40	45.5	9.1	5.5	60
Female	71	43.7	43.7	12.7		56.3	Female	71	36.6	50.7	8.5	4.2	63.4

REC038884

DEF_3318-0003

TEX_020951

Allendale

White	3					
African American	120	48.3	39.2	12.5		51.7
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	13	76.9	15.4	7.7		23.1
Not Disabled	112	44.6	42	13.4		55.4
Migrant						
Non migrant	125	48	39.2	12.8		52
Limited Eng, Pro						
Non LEP	125	48	39.2	12.8		52
Subsidized Meals	107	51.4	40.2	8.4		48.6
Full Pay Meals	18	27.8	33.3	38.9		72.2

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	129	69	24.8	3.1	3.1	31
Male	57	68.4	26.3	1.8	3.5	31.6
Female	71	69	23.9	4.2	7.8	31
White	3					
African American	124	68.5	25	3.2	3.2	31.5
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	16	87.5	12.5			12.5
Not Disabled	113	66.4	25.5	3.5	3.5	33.6
Migrant						

White	3					
African American	122	39.3	47.5	8.2		4.9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	15	40	53.3	6.7		60
Not Disabled	112	38.4	47.3	8.9		5.4
Migrant						
Non migrant	127	38.6	48	8.7		4.7
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	127	38.6	48	8.7		4.7
Subsidized Meals	109	40.4	50.5	5.5		3.7
Full Pay Meals	18	27.8	33.3	77.8		11.1

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	129	62.8	32.6	3.9	0.8	37.2
Male	57	66.7	28.1	3.5	1.8	33.3
Female	71	59.2	36.6	4.2		40.6
White	3					
African American	124	62.9	32.3	4	0.8	37.1
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	16	68.8	31.3			31.3
Not Disabled	113	61.9	32.7	4.4	0.9	38.1
Migrant						

REC038885

DEF_3318-0004

TEX_020952

Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	129	69	24.8	3.1	3.1	31	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	129	62.8	32.6	3.9	0.8	37.2
Non LEP Subsidized Meals	129	69	24.8	3.1	3.1	31	Non LEP Subsidized Meals	129	62.8	32.6	3.9	0.8	37.2
Full Pay Meals	111	71.2	27	1.8		28.8	Full Pay Meals	111	56.7	30.6	1.8	0.9	33.3
	18	55.6	11.1	11.1	22.2	44.4		18	38.9	44.4	16.7		61.1

Grade 5

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	127	52	37	11		48	All Students	131	46.6	43.5	8.4	1.5	53.4
Male	62	58.1	32.3	9.7		41.9	Male	65	53.8	35.4	9.2	1.5	46.2
Female	65	46.2	41.5	12.3		53.8	Female	66	39.4	51.5	7.6	1.5	60.6
White	2						White	2					
African American	121	52.9	37.2	0.9		47.1	African American	125	47.2	44	7.2	1.6	52.8
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	23	87	13			13	Disabled	27	74.1	25.9			25.9
Not Disabled	104	44.2	42.3	13.5		55.8	Not Disabled	104	39.4	48.1	10.6	1.9	60.6
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	127	52	37	11		48	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	131	46.6	43.5	8.4	1.5	53.4
Non LEP Subsidized Meals	126	51.6	37.5	11.1		48.4	Non LEP Subsidized Meals	130	46.2	43.8	8.5	1.5	53.8
Full Pay Meals	117	53	37.6	9.4		47	Full Pay Meals	120	46.7	45	7.5	0.8	53.3
	10	40	30	30		60		11	45.5	27.3	18.2	9.1	54.5

REC038886

DEF_3318-0005

TEX_020953

	Science						Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	137	72.3	24.1	2.2	1.5	27.7	All Students	137	70.8	26.3	2.2	0.7	29.2
Male	68	76.5	17.6	2.9	2.9	23.5	Male	68	70.6	26.5	1.5	1.5	29.4
Female	69	68.1	30.4	1.4		31.9	Female	69	71	26.1	2.9		29
White	2						White	2					
African American	131	73.3	24.4	2.3		26.7	African American	131	71.8	27.5	0.8		28.2
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	33	93.9	6.1			6.1	Disabled	33	93.9	6.1			6.1
Not Disabled	104	65.4	29.8	2.9	1.9	34.6	Not Disabled	104	63.5	32.7	2.9	1	35.5
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	137	72.3	24.1	2.2	1.5	27.7	Non migrant	137	70.8	26.3	2.2	0.7	29.2
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	136	72.1	24.3	2.2	1.5	27.9	Non LEP	136	70.6	26.5	2.2	0.7	29.4
Subsidized Meals	125	72.8	24	2.4	0.8	27.2	Subsidized Meals	125	72.8	24.8	2.4		27.2
Full Pay Meals	12	66.7	25		8.3	33.3	Full Pay Meals	12	50	41.7		8.3	50

Grade 6

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	111	69.4	22.5	8.1		30.6	All Students	114	52.6	36	8.8	2.6	47.4
Male	52	80.8	15.4	3.8		19.2	Male	55	61.8	34.5	3.6		38.2
Female	59	59.3	28.8	11.9		40.7	Female	59	44.1	37.3	13.6	5.1	55.9

REC038887

DEF_3318-0006

TEX_020954

White	4				
African American	106	71.7	21.7	6.6	28.3
Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic	1				
Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	16	100			
Not Disabled	95	64.2	26.3	9.5	35.8
Migrant					
Non migrant	111	69.4	22.5	8.1	30.6
Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	111	69.4	22.5	8.1	30.6
Subsidized Meals	97	7.1	21.6	7.2	28.9
Full Pay Meals	14	57.1	28.6	14.3	42.9

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3
Male	62	88.7	9.7	1.6		11.3
Female	61	78.7	16.4	3.3	1.6	21.3
White	4					
African American	118	85.6	11	2.5	0.8	14.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	25	96	4			4
Not Disabled	98	80.6	15.3	3.1	1	19.4
Migrant						

White	4					
African American	109	55	34.9	7.3	2.8	45
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	18	83.3	16.7			16.7
Not Disabled	96	46.9	39.6	10.4	3.1	53.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	114	52.6	36	8.8	2.6	47.4
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	114	52.6	36	8.8	2.6	47.4
Subsidized Meals	101	52.5	35.6	8.9	3	47.5
Full Pay Meals	13	53.8	38.5	7.7		46.2

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
Male	62	82.3	17.7			17.7
Female	61	68.9	24.6	4.9	1.6	31.1
White	4					
African American	118	77.1	19.5	2.5	0.8	22.9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	25	92	8			8
Not Disabled	98	71.4	24.5	3.1	1	28.6
Migrant						

REC038888

DEF_3318-0007

TEX_020955

Non migrant	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3	Non migrant	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3	Non LEP	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
Subsidized Meals	108	85.2	12	1.9	0.9	14.8	Subsidized Meals	108	76.9	19.4	2.8	0.9	23.1
Full Pay Meals	15	73.3	20	6.7		26.7	Full Pay Meals	15	66.7	33.3			33.3

Grade 7

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	129	51.2	38.8	10.1		48.8	All Students	131	60.3	30.5	8.4	0.8	39.7
Male	51	54.9	4.2	3.9		45.1	Male	54	59.3	37	1.9	1.9	40.7
Female	78	48.7	37.2	14.1		51.3	Female	77	61	26	13		39
White	7						White	7					
African American	119	52.1	37.8	10.1		47.9	African American	121	63.6	28.1	7.4	0.8	30.4
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	6						Disabled	10	90	10			10
Not Disabled	123	48.8	40.7	10.6		51.2	Not Disabled	121	57.9	32.2	9.1	0.8	42.1
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	129	51.2	38.8	10.1		48.8	Non migrant	131	60.3	30.5	8.4	0.8	39.7
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	128	50.8	39.1	10.2		49.2	Non LEP	130	60	30.8	8.5	0.8	40
Subsidized Meals	109	54.1	38.5	7.3		45.9	Subsidized Meals	111	64	28.8	7.2		36
Full Pay Meals	20	35	40	25		65	Full Pay Meals	20	40	40	15	5	60

REC038889

- DEF_3318-0008

TEX_020956

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	167	73.1	24	1.8	1.2	26.9	All Students	166	83.1	16.3		0.6	16.9
Male	82	75.6	22	1.2	1.2	24.4	Male	81	82.7	17.3			17.3
Female	82	69.5	26.8	2.4	1.2	30.5	Female	82	82.9	15.9		1.2	17.1
White	7						White	7					
African American	154	76	22.1	0.6	1.3	24	African American	153	85.6	13.7		0.7	14.4
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	43	100					Disabled	41	95.1	4.9			4.9
Not Disabled	124	63.7	32.3	2.4	1.6	36.3	Not Disabled	125	79.2	20		0.8	20.8
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	167	73.1	24	1.8	1.2	26.9	Non migrant	166	83.1	16.3		0.6	15.9
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	166	73.5	23.5	1.8	1.2	26.5	Non LEP	165	83	16.4		0.6	17
Subsidized Meals	42	76.8	21.1	1.4	0.7	23.2	Subsidized Meals	141	85.8	13.5		0.7	14.2
Full Pay Meals	25	52	40	4	4	48	Full Pay Meals	25	68	32			32

Grade 8

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	96	46.9	43.8	8.3	1	53.1	All Students	101	52.5	38.6	6.9	2	47.5
Male	44	54.5	40.9	4.5		45.5	Male	47	57.4	31.9	10.6		42.6
Female	52	40.4	46.2	11.5	1.9	59.6	Female	54	48.1	44.4	3.7	3.7	51.9

REC038890

DEF_3318-0009

TEX_020957

Allendale

White	5					
African American	89	49.4	41.5	7.9	1.1	50.6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	3					
Not Disabled	93	45.2	45.2	8.6	1.1	54.8
Migrant						
Non migrant	96	46.9	43.8	8.3	1	53.1
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	95	46.3	44.2	8.4	1.1	53.7
Subsidized Meals	79	50.6	41.8	6.3	1.3	49.4
Full Pay Meals	17	29.4	52.9	17.6		70.6

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	116	78.4	19.8	0.9	0.9	21.6
Male	58	81	19			19
Female	58	75.9	20.7	1.7	1.7	24.1
White	5					
African American	109	79.8	18.3	0.9	0.9	20.2
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	22	100				
Not Disabled	94	73.4	24.5	1.1	1.1	26.6
Migrant						

White	5					
African American	94	54.3	37.2	6.4	2.1	45.7
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	94	50	40.4	7.4	2.1	50
Migrant						
Non migrant	101	52.5	38.6	6.9	2	47.5
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	100	52	39	7	2	48
Subsidized Meals	83	53	37.3	7.2	2.4	47
Full Pay Meals	18	50	44.4	5.6		50

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	113	78.8	17.7	1.8	1.8	21.2
Male	55	78.2	18.2		3.6	21.8
Female	58	79.3	17.2	3.4		20.7
White	5					
African American	106	83	14.2	1.9	0.9	17
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	21	90.5	9.5			9.5
Not Disabled	92	76.1	19.6	2.2	2.2	23.9
Migrant						

REC038891

DEF_3318-0010

TEX_020958

Allendale

Non migrant	116	78.4	19.8	0.9	0.9	21.6	Non migrant	116	78.8	17.7	1.8	1.8	21.2
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	115	78.3	20	0.9	0.9	21.7	Non LEP	112	78.6	17.9	1.8	1.8	21.4
Subsidized Meals	97	79.4	18.6	1	1	20.6	Subsidized Meals	95	81.1	16.8	2.1		18.9
Full Pay Meals	19	73.7	26.3			26.3	Full Pay Meals	18	66.7	22.2		11.1	33.3

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

[\[top\]](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#)

This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:53:15AM from server web02



This page is Bobby Approved

REC038892

DEF_3318-0011

TEX_020959

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | SBE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SBE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

☆ Bookmark This Page Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[return to main PACT Report page]
 [return to main Allendale PACT Report page]

Allendale Elementary - Allendale

Page Generated
 11 28 25
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Allendale Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	english/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	68	35.3	36.8	27.9		64.7	All Students	69	30.4	62.3	5.8	1.4	69.6
Male	38	42.1	31.6	26.3		57.9	Male	39	28.2	64.1	7.7		71.8
Female	30	26.7	43.3	30		73.3	Female	30	33.3	60	3.3	3.3	66.7
White							White						
African American	66	34.8	37.9	27.3		65.2	African American	67	31.3	61.2	6	1.5	68.7
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	8						Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	60	31.7	36.7	31.7		68.3	Not Disabled	60	23.3	68.3	6.7	1.7	76.7

REC038893

DEF_3318-0012

TEX_020960

Allendale

Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	68	35.3	36.8	27.9		64.7	Non migrant	69	30.4	62.3	5.8	1.4	69.6
Limited Eng, Prof	2						Limited Eng Prof	2				1.5	68.7
Non LEP	66	34.8	37.9	27.3		65.2	Non LEP	67	31.3	61.7	6		
Subsidized Meals	65	36.9	36.9	26.2		63.1	Subsidized Meals	66	30.3	63.6	4.5	1.5	69.7
Full Pay Meals	3						Full Pay Meals	3					

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	69	75.4	23.2	1.4		24.6
Male	39	79.5	17.9	2.6		20.5
Female	30	70	30			30
White						
African American	67	74.6	23.9	1.5		25.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	60	71.7	26.7	1.7		28.3
Migrant						
Non migrant	69	75.4	23.2	1.4		24.6
Limited Eng, Prof	2					
Non LEP	67	74.6	23.9	1.5		25.4
Subsidized Meals	66	75.8	22.7	1.5		24.2
Full Pay Meals	3					

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	69	84.1	15.9			15.9
Male	39	87.2	12.8			12.8
Female	30	80	20			20
White						
African American	67	85.1	14.9			14.9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	60	81.7	18.3			18.3
Migrant						
Non migrant	69	84.1	15.9			15.9
Limited Eng Prof	2					
Non LEP	67	85.1	14.9			14.9
Subsidized Meals	66	87.9	12.1			12.1
Full Pay Meals	3					

Grade 4

REC038894

DEF_3318-0013

TEX_020961

Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	66	71.2	25.8	1.5	1.5	28.8
Migrant						
Non migrant	75	74.7	22.7	1.3	1.3	25.3
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	75	74.7	22.7	1.3	1.3	25.3
Subsidized Meals	72	75	23.6	1.4		25
Full Pay Meals	3					

Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	66	65.2	30.3	3	1.5	34.8
Migrant						
Non migrant	75	68	28	2.7	1.3	32
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	75	68	28	2.7	1.3	32
Subsidized Meals	72	68	29.2	1.4	1.4	31.9
Full Pay Meals	3					

Grade 5

	English/Language Arts					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	91	60.4	33	6.6		39.6
Male	46	67.4	30.4	2.2		32.6
Female	45	53.3	35.6	11.1		46.7
White						
African American	87	60.9	32.2	6.9		39.1
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	20	90	10			10
Not Disabled	71	52.1	39.4	8.5		47.9
Migrant						

	Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	92	56.5	33.7	7.6	2.2	43.5
Male	47	66	23.4	8.5	2.1	34
Female	45	46.7	44.4	6.7	2.2	53.3
White						
African American	88	56.8	34.1	6.8	2.3	43.2
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	21	76.2	23.8			23.8
Not Disabled	71	50.7	36.6	9.9	2.8	49.3
Migrant						

REC038896

DEF_3318-0015

TEX_020963

Allendale

Non migrant	91	60.4	33	6.5	39.6	Non migrant	92	56.5	33.7	7.6	2.2	43.5
Limited Eng Prof	1					Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	90	60	33.3	6.7	40	Non LEP	91	56	34.1	7.7	2.2	44
Subsidized Meals	81	63	33.3	3.7	37	Subsidized Meals	82	58.5	34.1	6.1	1.2	41.5
Full Pay Meals	10	40	30	30	60	Full Pay Meals	10	40	30	20	10	60

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	92	77.2	20.7	1.1	1.1	22.8
Male	46	84.8	10.9	7.2	2.2	15.2
Female	46	69.6	30.4			30.4
White						
African American	88	77.3	21.6	1.1		22.7
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	21	95.2	4.8			4.8
Not Disabled	71	71.8	25.4	1.4	1.4	28.2
Migrant						
Non migrant	92	77.2	20.7	1.1	1.1	22.8
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	91	76.9	20.9	1.1	1.1	23.1
Subsidized Meals	82	78	20.7	1.2		22
Full Pay Meals	10	70	20		10	30

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	92	73.9	25		1.1	26.1
Male	46	76.1	21.7		2.2	23.9
Female	46	71.7	28.3			28.3
White						
African American	88	73.9	26.1			26.1
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	21	95.2	4.8			4.8
Not Disabled	71	67.6	31		1.4	32.4
Migrant						
Non migrant	92	73.9	25		1.1	26.1
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	91	73.6	25.3		1.1	26.4
Subsidized Meals	82	76.8	23.2			23.2
Full Pay Meals	10	50	40		10	50

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

1. There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade

REC038897

DEF_3318-0016

TEX_020964

- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
 This page generated on Wed Sep ember 08 2004 at 11:28:26AM from server wab02



This page is Bobby Approved

REC038898

DEF_3318-0017

TEX_020965

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAPI |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

Bookmark This Page, Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\[return to main PACT Report page\]](#)
[\[return to main Allendale PACT Report page\]](#)

Allendale-Fairfax Middle - Allendale

Page Generated
 10 53 30
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Allendale-Fairfax Middle

Scores by Demographic

Grade 6

	English/Language Arts					Mathematics							
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	111	69.4	22.5	8.1		30.6	All Students	114	52.6	36.8	8.8	2.6	47.4
Male	52	80.8	15.4	3.8		19.2	Male	55	61.8	34.5	3.6		38.2
Female	59	59.3	28.8	11.9		40.7	Female	59	44.1	37.3	13.6	5.1	55.9
White	4						White	4					
African American	106	71.7	21.7	6.6		28.3	African American	109	55	34.9	7.3	2.8	45
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	16	100					Disabled	18	83.3	16.7			16.7
Not Disabled	95	64.2	26.3	9.5		35.8	Not Disabled	96	46.9	39.6	10.4	3.1	53.1

REC038899

DEF_3318-0018

TEX_020966

Migrant												
Non migrant	111	69.4	22.5	8.1		30.6						
Limited Eng Prof												
Non LEP	111	69.4	22.5	8.1		30.6						
Subsidized Meals	97	71.1	21.6	7.2		28.9						
Full Pay Meals	14	57.1	28.6	14.3		42.9						

Migrant												
Non migrant	114	52.6	36	8.8		2.6						47.4
Limited Eng Prof												
Non LEP	114	52.6	36	8.8		2.6						47.4
Subsidized Meals	101	52.5	35.6	8.9		3						47.5
Full Pay Meals	13	53.8	38.5	7.7								46.2

Science						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3
Male	62	88.7	9.7	1.6		11.3
Female	61	78.7	16.4	3.3	1.6	21.3
White	4					
African American	118	85.6	11	2.5	0.8	14.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	25	96	4			4
Not Disabled	98	80.6	15.3	3.1	1	19.4
Migrant						
Non migrant	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	123	83.7	13	2.4	0.8	16.3
Subsidized Meals	08	85.7	12	1.9	0.9	14.8
Full Pay Meals	15	73.3	20	6.7		26.7

Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	123	75.6	21.1	7.4	0.8	24.4
Male	62	82.3	17.7			17.7
Female	61	68.9	24.6	4.9	1.6	31.1
White	4					
African American	118	77.1	19.5	2.5	0.8	22.9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	25	92	8			8
Not Disabled	98	71.4	24.5	3.1	1	28.6
Migrant						
Non migrant	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	123	75.6	21.1	2.4	0.8	24.4
Subsidized Meals	108	76.9	19.4	2.8	0.9	23.1
Full Pay Meals	15	66.7	33.3			33.3

Grade 7

REC038900

DEF_3318-0019

TEX_020967

	English/Language Arts					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	129	51.2	38.8	10.1		48.8
Male	51	54.9	41.2	3.9		45.1
Female	78	48.7	37.2	14.1		51.3
White	7					
African American	119	52.1	37.8	10.1		47.9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	6					
Not Disabled	123	48.8	40.7	10.6		51.2
Migrant						
Non migrant	129	51.2	38.8	10.1		48.8
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	128	50.8	39.1	10.2		49.2
Subsidized Meals	109	54.1	38.5	7.3		45.9
Full Pay Meals	20	35	40	25		65

	Science					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	167	73.1	24	1.8	1.2	26.9
Male	82	75.6	22	1.2	1.2	24.4
Female	82	69.5	26.8	2.4	1.2	30.5
White	7					
African American	154	76	22.1	0.6	1.3	24
Asian/Pacific						

	Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	131	60.3	30.5	8.4	0.8	39.7
Male	54	59.3	37	1.9	1.9	40.7
Female	77	61	26	13		39
White	7					
African American	121	63.6	28.1	7.4	0.8	36.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	10	90	10			10
Not Disabled	121	57.9	32.2	9.1	0.8	42.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	131	60.3	30.5	8.4	0.8	39.7
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	130	60	30.8	8.5	0.8	40
Subsidized Meals	111	64	28.8	7.2		36
Full Pay Meals	20	40	40	15	5	60

	Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	165	83.1	16.3		0.6	16.9
Male	81	82.7	17.3			17.3
Female	82	82.9	15.9		1.2	17.1
White	7					
African American	153	85.6	13.7		0.7	14.4
Asian/Pacific						

REC038901

DEF_3318-0020

TEX_020968

Is						
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	43	100				
Not Disabled	124	63.7	32.3	2.4	1.6	36.3
Migrant						
Non migrant	167	73.1	24	1.8	1.2	26.9
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	166	73.5	23.5	1.8	1.2	26.5
Subsidized Meals	142	76.8	21.1	1.4	0.7	23.2
Full Pay Meals	25	52	40	4	4	48

Is					
Hispanic	3				
Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	41	95.1	4.9		4.9
Not Disabled	125	79.2	20	0.8	20.8
Migrant					
Non migrant	166	83.1	16.3	0.6	16.9
Limited Eng Prof	1				
Non LEP	165	83	16.4	0.6	17
Subsidized Meals	141	85.8	13.5	0.7	14.2
Full Pay Meals	25	68	32		32

Grade 8

	English/Language Arts					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	96	46.9	43.8	8.3	1	53.1
Male	44	54.5	40.9	4.5		45.5
Female	52	40.4	46.2	11.5	1.9	59.6
White	5					
African American	89	49.4	41.6	7.9	1.1	50.6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	3					
Not Disabled	93	45.2	45.2	8.6	1.1	54.8
Migrant						

	Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	101	57.5	38.6	6.9	2	47.5
Male	47	57.4	31.9	10.6		42.6
Female	54	48.1	44.4	3.7	3.7	51.9
White	5					
African American	94	54.3	37.2	6.4	2.1	45.7
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	94	50	40.4	7.4	2.1	50
Migrant						

REC038902

DEF_3318-0021

TEX_020969

Allendale

Non migrant	96	46.9	43.8	8.3	1	53.1	Non migrant	101	52.5	38.6	6.9	2	47.5
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	95	46.3	44.2	8.4	1.1	53.7	Non LEP	100	52	39	7	2	48
Subsidized Meals	79	50.6	41.8	6.3	1.3	49.4	Subsidized Meals	83	53	37.3	7.2	2.4	47
Full Pay Meals	17	29.4	52.9	17.6		70.6	Full Pay Meals	18	50	44.4	5.6		50

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	116	78.4	19.8	0.9	0.9	21.6
Male	58	81	19			19
Female	58	75.9	20.7	1.7	1.7	24.1
White	5					
African American	109	79.8	18.3	0.9	0.9	20.2
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	22	100				
Not Disabled	94	73.4	24.5	1.1	1.1	26.6
Migrant						
Non migrant	116	78.4	19.8	0.9	0.9	21.6
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	115	78.3	20	0.9	0.9	21.7
Subsidized Meals	97	79.4	18.6	1	1	20.6
Full Pay Meals	19	73.7	26.3			26.3

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	113	78.8	17.7	1.6	1.8	21.2
Male	55	78.2	18.2		3.6	21.8
Female	58	79.3	17.2	3.4		20.7
White	5					
African American	106	83	14.2	1.9	0.9	17
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	21	90.5	9.5			9.5
Not Disabled	92	76.1	19.6	2.2	2.2	23.9
Migrant						
Non migrant	113	78.8	17.7	1.8	1.8	21.2
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	112	78.6	17.9	1.8	1.8	21.4
Subsidized Meals	95	81.1	16.8	2.1		18.9
Full Pay Meals	18	66.7	22.2		11.1	33.3

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons:

- 1. There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade.

REC038903

DEF_3318-0022

TEX_020970

- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school at a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders



| [Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
 This page generated on Wed, September 08, 2004 at 10:53:32AM from server / et02

This page is Bobby Approved

REC038904

DEF_3318-0023

TEX_020971

DEF_3318-0024

REC038905

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | | SEE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP!!

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

Bookmark This Page | Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\(return to main PACT Report page\)](#)
[\(return to main Allendale PACT Report page\)](#)

Fairfax Elementary - Allendale

Page Generated
 10 53 52
 Wed, September 08, 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Fairfax Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	33	36.4	36.4	24.2	3	63.6	All Students	34	35.3	58.8	5.9	64.7
Male	13	38.5	15.4	38.5	7.7	61.5	Male	13	46.2	38.5	15.4	53.8
Female	20	35	50	15		65	Female	20	30	70		70
White	1						White	1				
African American	32	37.5	37.5	21.9	3.1	62.5	African American	32	37.5	56.3	6.3	62.5
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic							Hispanic					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	4						Disabled	5				
Not Disabled	29	31	37.9	27.6	3.4	69	Not Disabled	29	31	62.1	6.9	69

REC038906

DEF_3318-0025
 TEX_020972

Migrant							Migrant					
Non migrant	33	36.4	36.4	24.2	3	63.6	Non migrant	34	35.3	58.8	5.9	64.7
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	33	36.4	36.4	24.2	3	63.6	Non LEP	34	35.3	58.8	5.9	64.7
Subsidized Meals	23	34.8	47.8	17.4		65.2	Subsidized Meals	23	39.1	60.9		60.9
Full Pay Meals	10	40	10	40	10	60	Full Pay Meals	11	27.3	54.5	18.2	72.7

Science

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	42	81	16.7	2.4		19	All Students	42	78.6	21.4			21.4
Male	19	78.9	15.8	5.3		21.1	Male	19	73.7	26.3			26.3
Female	22	81.8	18.2			18.2	Female	22	81.8	18.2			18.2
White	1						White	1					
African American	40	80	17.5	2.5		20	African American	10	80	20			20
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	13	92.3	7.7			7.7	Disabled	13	92.3	7.7			7.7
Not Disabled	29	75.9	20.7	3.4		24.1	Not Disabled	29	72.4	27.6			27.6
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	42	81	16.7	2.4		19	Non migrant	42	78.6	21.4			21.4
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	42	81	16.7	2.4		19	Non LEP	42	78.6	21.4			21.4
Subsidized Meals	28	89.3	10.7			10.7	Subsidized Meals	28	85.7	14.3			14.3
Full Pay Meals	14	64.3	28.6	7.1		35.7	Full Pay Meals	14	64.3	35.7			35.7

Grade 4

REC038907

DEF_3318-0026

TEX_020973

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	51	41.2	39.2	10.6		58.8	All Students	53	34	45.3	15.1	5.7	66
Male	20	40	40	20		60	Male	22	31.8	45.5	13.6	9.1	68.2
Female	30	43.3	36.7	20		56.7	Female	30	33.3	46.7	16.7	3.3	66.7
White	2						White	2					
African American	48	41.7	39.6	18.8		58.3	African American	50	34	46	14	6	66
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan							Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	5						Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	46	37	43.5	19.6		63	Not Disabled	46	32.6	45.7	15.2	6.5	67.4
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	51	41.2	39.2	19.6		58.8	Non migrant	53	34	45.3	15.1	5.7	56
Limited Eng Pro							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	51	41.2	39.2	19.6		58.8	Non LEP	53	34	45.3	15.1	5.7	66
Subsidized Meals	36	50	38.9	11.1		50	Subsidized Meals	38	36.8	50	7.9	5.3	63.2
Full Pay Meals	15	20	40	40		80	Full Pay Meals	15	26.7	33.3	33.3	6.7	73.3
Science							Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	54	61.1	27.8	5.6	5.6	38.9	All Students	54	55.6	38.9	5.6		44.4
Male	23	65.2	21.7	4.3	8.7	34.8	Male	23	52.2	39.1	8.7		47.8
Female	30	56.7	33.3	6.7	3.3	43.3	Female	30	56.7	40	3.3		43.3
White	2						White	2					
African American	51	60.8	27.5	5.9	5.9	39.2	African American	51	54.9	39.2	5.9		45.1
Asian/Pacific							Asian/Pacific						

REC038908

DEF_3318-0027

TEX_020974

Is						Is						
Hispanic						Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	7					Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	47	59.6	27.7	6.4	6.4	40.4	Not Disabled	47	57.4	36.2	6.4	42.6
Migrant							Migrant					
Non migrant	54	61.1	27.8	5.6	5.6	38.9	Non migrant	54	55.6	38.9	5.6	44.4
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	54	61.1	27.8	5.6	5.6	38.9	Non LEP	54	55.6	38.9	5.6	44.4
Subsidized Meals	39	64.1	33.3	2.6		35.9	Subsidized Meals	39	64.1	33.3	2.6	35.9
Full Pay Meals	15	53.3	13.3	13.3	20	46.7	Full Pay Meals	15	33.3	53.3	13.3	66.7

Grade 5

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	36	30.6	47.2	22.2		69.4	All Students	39	23.1	66.7	10.3	76.9
Male	16	31.3	37.5	31.3		68.8	Male	18	22.2	66.7	11.1	77.8
Female	20	30	55	15		70	Female	21	23.8	66.7	9.5	76.2
White	2						White	2				
African American	34	32.4	50	17.6		67.6	African American	37	24.3	67.6	8.1	75.7
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic							Hispanic					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	3						Disabled	6				
Not Disabled	33	27.3	48.5	24.2		72.7	Not Disabled	33	15.2	72.7	12.1	84.8
Migrant							Migrant					

REC038909

DEF_3318-0028

TEX_020975

Non migrant	36	30 6	47 2	22 2		69 4
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	36	30 6	47 2	22 2		69 4
Subsidized Meals	36	30 6	47 2	22 2		69 4
Full Pay Meals						

Non migrant	39	23 1	66 7	10 3		76 9
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	39	23 1	66 7	10 3		76 9
Subsidized Meals	38	21 1	68 4	10 5		78 9
Full Pay Meals	1					

Science

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	45	62 2	31 1	4 4	2 2	37 8
Male	22	59 1	31 8	4 5		40 9
Female	23	65 2	30 4	4 3		34 8
White	2					
African American	43	65 1	30 2	4 7		34 9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	12	91 7	8 3			8 3
Not Disabled	33	51 5	39 4	6 1	3	48 5
Migrant						
Non migrant	45	62 2	31 1	4 4	2 2	37 8
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	45	62 2	31 1	4 4	2 2	37 8
Subsidized Meals	43	62 8	30 2	4 7	2 3	37 2
Full Pay Meals	2					

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	45	64 4	28 9	6 7		35 6
Male	22	59 1	36 4	4 5		40 9
Female	23	69 6	21 7	8 7		30 4
White	2					
African American	43	67 4	30 2	2 3		32 6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	12	91 7	8 3			8 3
Not Disabled	33	54 5	36 4	9 1		45 5
Migrant						
Non migrant	45	64 4	28 9	6 7		35 6
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	45	64 4	28 9	6 7		35 6
Subsidized Meals	43	65 1	27 9	7		34 9
Full Pay Meals	2					

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

- 1. There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade

- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |

This page generated on Wed, September 09, 2004 at 10:53:53AM from server web04.



This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038911

TEX_020977



DEF_3318-0030

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP!!

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

APPLY FOR THE SDE | Search The Site



2004 PACT Test Scores - By District

[return to main PACT Report page]
 [return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page]

Dillon 2

Page Generated
 10 54 14
 Wed, September 08, 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Dillon 2

All Student Scores by Grade

English/Language Arts							Mathematics						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	288	16	31.3	43.8	9	84	3	289	13.1	49.1	27	10.7	86.9
4	274	36.9	39.8	22.6	0.7	63.1	4	277	36.1	36.8	17.7	9.4	63.9
5	243	37	41.6	19.8	1.6	63	5	246	36.6	41.5	13.8	8.1	63.4
6	273	51.6	34.4	11.4	2.6	48.4	6	273	30.8	44	19	6.2	69.2
7	290	47.9	37.2	13.8	1	52.1	7	290	54.1	36.9	5.5	3.4	45.9
8	247	51.4	38.5	8.9	1.2	48.6	8	245	54.7	35.9	6.9	2.4	45.3

Science							Social Studies						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	295	46.8	39	12.5	1.7	53.2	3	293	37.9	51.2	7.5	3.4	62.1
4	275	58.2	28.4	6.2	7.3	41.8	4	275	43.6	40.4	11.6	4.4	56.4
5	243	65.4	22.6	7	4.9	34.6	5	243	61.7	28.4	5.8	4.1	38.3
6	273	68.1	17.6	10.3	4	31.9	6	273	56.4	34.8	4.4	4.4	43.6
7	290	60.3	30.7	5.9	3.1	39.7	7	289	57.8	33.6	5.5	3.1	42.2

REC038912

DEF_3319

TEX_020978

8 247 71.3 26.7 12 0.8 28.7 8 247 59.9 32.8 4.9 2.4 40.1

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	288	16	31.3	43.8	9	84	289	13.1	49.1	27	10.7	86.9	
Male	143	20.3	33.6	37.1	9.1	79.7	144	18.1	48.6	24.3	9	81.9	
Female	145	11.7	29	50.3	9	88.3	145	8.3	49.7	29.7	12.4	91.7	
White	81	11.1	14.8	59.3	14.8	88.9	81	8.6	35.8	38.3	17.3	91.4	
African American	190	17.4	36.3	38.9	7.4	82.6	African American	191	15.2	55.5	21.5	7.9	84.8
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	9						Hispanic	9					
Am Indian/Alaskan	7						Am Indian/Alaskan	7					
Disabled	33	45.5	33.3	12.1	9.1	54.5	Disabled	34	41.2	29.4	20.6	8.8	58.8
Not Disabled	255	12.2	31	47.8	9	87.8	Not Disabled	255	9.4	51.8	27.8	11	90.6
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	288	16	31.3	43.8	9	84	Non migrant	289	13.1	49.1	27	10.7	86.9
Limited Eng Prof	7						Limited Eng Prof	7					
Non LEP	281	15.3	31.3	44.1	9.3	84.7	Non LEP	282	13.1	49.6	26.2	11	86.9
Subsidized Meals	242	17.8	34.7	40.9	6.6	82.2	Subsidized Meals	243	14	53.5	23	9.5	86
Full Pay Meals	46	6.5	13	58.7	21.7	93.5	Full Pay Meals	46	8.7	26.1	47.8	17.4	91.3

REC038913

DEF_3319-0002

TEX_020979

	Science						Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	295	46.8	39	12.5	1.7	53.2	All Students	293	37.9	51.2	7.5	3.4	62.1
Male	149	47	40.3	9.4		53	Male	147	44.9	43.5	7.5	4.1	55.1
Female	146	46.6	37.7	15.8		53.4	Female	146	30.8	58.9	7.5	2.7	69.2
White	81	32.1	34.6	28.4	4.9	67.9	White	81	19.8	58	16	6.2	80.2
African American	195	52.3	40	7.2	0.5	47.7	African American	194	45.9	47.9	3.6	2.6	54.1
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic Am	9						Hispanic Am	9					
Indian/Alaskan	9						Indian/Alaskan	8					
Disabled	39	64.1	25.6	5.1	5.1	35.9	Disabled	38	68.4	23.7	7.9		31.6
Not Disabled	256	44.1	41	13.7	1.2	55.9	Not Disabled	255	33.3	55.3	7.5	3.9	66.7
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	295	46.8	39	12.5	1.7	53.2	Non migrant	293	37.9	51.2	7.5	3.4	62.1
Limited Eng Prof	7						Limited Eng Prof	7					
Non LEP	288	47.2	38.2	12.8	1.7	52.8	Non LEP	286	38.5	51	7	3.5	61.5
Subsidized Meals	249	51.4	37.3	10.8	0.4	48.6	Subsidized Meals	247	41.3	51	6.5	1.2	58.7
Full Pay Meals	46	21.7	47.8	21.7	8.7	78.3	Full Pay Meals	46	19.6	52.2	13	15.2	80.4

Grade 4

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	274	36.9	39.8	22.6	0.7	63.1	All Students	277	36.1	36.8	17.7	9.4	63.9
Male	148	42.6	38.5	18.9		57.4	Male	150	41.3	34	15.3	9.3	58.7
Female	126	30.2	41.3	27	1.6	69.8	Female	127	29.9	40.2	20.5	9.4	70.1

REC038914

DEF_3319-0003

TEX_020980

Dillon 2

White	66	18 2	31 8	50		81 8
African American	193	44	40 9	14	1	56
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	24	62 5	25	12 5		37 5
Not Disabled	250	34 4	41 2	23 6	0 8	65 6
Migrant						
Non migrant	274	36 9	39 8	22 6	0 7	63 1
Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	269	37 2	39 4	22 7	0 7	62 8
Subsidized Meals	234	40 6	40 2	18 8	0 4	59 4
Full Pay Meals	40	15	37 5	45	2 5	85

White	67	19 4	37 3	23 9		19 4	80 6
African American	194	41 8	36 6	16 5		5 2	58 2
Asian/Pacific Is	2						
Hispanic	5						
Am Indian/Alaskan	9						
Disabled	26	65 4	23 1	7 7		3 8	34 6
Not Disabled	251	33 1	38 2	18 7		10	66 9
Migrant							
Non migrant	277	36 1	36 8	17 7		9 4	63 9
Limited Eng Prof	6						
Non LEP	271	36 2	37 3	17 7		8 9	63 8
Subsidized Meals	237	38 8	37 6	17 3		6 3	61 2
Full Pay Meals	40	20	32 5	20		27 5	80

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	275	58 2	28 4	6 2	7 3	41 8
Male	148	60 1	27 7	5 4	6 8	39 9
Female	127	55 9	29 1	7 1	7 9	44 1
White	67	37 3	37 3	7 5	17 9	62 7
African American	193	64 8	26 4	5 7	3 1	35 2
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	25	68	32			32
Not Disabled	250	57 2	28	6 8	8	42 8
Migrant						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	275	43 6	40 4	11 6	4 4	56 4
Male	148	47 3	40 5	8 8	3 4	52 7
Female	127	39 4	40 2	15	5 5	60 6
White	67	31 3	35 8	22 4	10 4	68 7
African American	193	49 2	41 5	6 7	2 6	50 8
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	25	56	36	8		44
Not Disabled	250	42 4	40 8	12	4 8	57 6
Migrant						

REC038915

DEF_3319-0004

TEX_020981

Non migrant	275	58.2	28.4	6.2	7.3	41.8	Non migrant	275	43.6	40.4	11.6	4.4	56.4
Limited Eng, Prof	5						Limited Eng, Prof	5					
Non LEP	270	58.5	28.5	5.9	7	41.5	Non LEP	270	44.1	40.4	11.1	4.4	55.9
Subsidized Meals	235	63	27.2	5.1	4.7	37	Subsidized Meals	235	47.2	40.9	9.8	2.1	52.8
Full Pay Meals	40	30	35	12.5	22.5	70	Full Pay Meals	40	22.5	37.5	22.5	17.5	77.5

Grade 5

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	243	37	41.6	19.8	1.6	63	All Students	246	36.6	41.5	13.8	8.1	63.4
Male	134	48.5	34.3	15.7	1.5	51.5	Male	134	37.3	42.5	10.4	9.7	62.7
Female	109	22.9	50.5	24.8	1.8	77.1	Female	112	35.7	40.2	17.9	6.3	64.3
White	63	17.5	39.7	39.7	3.2	82.5	White	63	15.9	44.4	19	20.6	84.1
African American	168	44	41.1	13.7	1.2	56	African American	169	43.8	40.2	13	3	56.2
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	10	40	60			60	Am Indian/Alaskan	10	30	50		20	70
Disabled	14	85.7	14.3			14.3	Disabled	15	73.3	20	6.7		26.7
Not Disabled	229	34.1	43.2	21	1.7	65.9	Not Disabled	231	34.2	42.9	14.3	8.7	65.8
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	243	37	41.6	19.8	1.6	63	Non migrant	246	36.6	41.5	13.8	8.1	63.4
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	3					
Non LEP	242	37.2	41.3	19.8	1.7	62.8	Non LEP	243	36.2	41.6	14	8.2	63.8
Subsidized Meals	206	39.3	43.2	16.5	1	60.7	Subsidized Meals	209	40.7	41.6	12	5.7	59.3
Full Pay Meals	37	24.3	32.4	37.8	5.4	75.7	Full Pay Meals	37	13.5	40.5	24.3	21.6	86.5

REC038916

DEF_3319-0005

TEX_020982

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	243	65.4	22.6	7.4	4.9	34.6	All Students	243	61.7	28.4	5.8	4.1	38.3
Male	134	67.2	20.9	7.5	4.5	32.8	Male	134	64.9	27.6	3.3	4.5	35.1
Female	109	63.3	24.8	6.4	5.5	36.7	Female	109	57.8	29.4	9.2	3.7	42.2
White	63	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	57.1	White	63	42.9	36.5	12.7	7.9	57.1
African American	168	73.2	20.2	4.8	1.8	26.8	African American	168	67.9	26.2	3.3	3.3	32.1
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan	10	80	20			20	Am Indian/Alaskan	10	70	20	10		30
Disabled	14	92.9	7.1			7.1	Disabled	14	100				
Not Disabled	229	63.8	23.6	7.4	5.2	36.2	Not Disabled	229	59.4	30.1	6.1	4.4	40.6
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	243	65.4	22.6	7.4	4.9	34.6	Non migrant	243	61.7	28.4	5.8	4.1	38.3
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	242	65.7	22.3	7.4	5.0	34.3	Non LEP	242	61.6	28.5	5.8	4.1	38.4
Subsidized Meals	206	69.4	22.3	5.8	2.4	30.6	Subsidized Meals	206	65	28.2	4.9	1.9	35
Full Pay Meals	37	43.2	24.3	13.5	18.9	56.8	Full Pay Meals	37	43.2	29.7	10.8	16.2	56.8

Grade 6

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	51.6	34.4	11.4	2.6	48.4	All Students	273	30.8	44	19	6.2	69.2
Male	135	57	30.4	11.9	0.7	43	Male	135	34.8	39.3	22.2	3.7	65.2
Female	138	46.4	38.4	10.9	4.3	53.6	Female	138	26.8	48.6	15.9	8.7	73.2

REC038917

DEF_3319-0006

TEX_020983

Dillon 2

White	85	44.7	32.9	17.6	4.7	55.3	White	85	30.6	31.8	22.4	15.3	69.4
African American	180	54.4	35.6	8.9	1.1	45.6	African American	180	30.6	50	17.8	1.7	69.4
Asian/Pacific Is	2						Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3						Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9						Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	50.4	35.2	11.7	2.7	49.6	Not Disabled	264	30.7	43.9	18.9	6.4	69.3
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	273	51.6	34.4	11.4	2.6	48.4	Non migrant	273	30.8	44	19	6.2	69.2
Limited Eng Prof	4						Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	269	51.7	34.6	11.5	2.2	48.3	Non LEP	269	31.2	43.9	19	5.9	68.8
Subsidized Meals	230	56.1	34.3	7.8	1.7	43.9	Subsidized Meals	230	33	45.7	17.4	3.9	67
Full Pay Meals	43	27.9	34.9	30.2	7	72.1	Full Pay Meals	43	18.6	34.9	27.9	18.6	81.4

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	68.1	17.6	10.3	4	31.9
Male	135	64.4	17.8	14.1	3.7	35.6
Female	138	71.7	17.4	6.5	4.3	28.3
White	85	55.3	20	15.3	9.4	44.7
African American	180	73.9	16.7	7.8	1.7	26.1
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	67.4	17.8	10.6	4.2	32.6
Migrant						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	56.4	34.8	4.4	4.4	43.6
Male	135	57.8	34.1	5.2	3	42.2
Female	138	55.1	35.5	3.6	5.8	44.9
White	85	51.8	32.9	8.2	7.1	48.2
African American	180	57.2	37.2	2.2	3.3	42.8
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	56.1	34.8	4.5	4.5	43.9
Migrant						

REC038918

DEF_3319-0007

TEX_020984

Dillon 2

Non migrant	273	68.1	17.6	10.3	4	31.9	Non migrant	273	56.4	34.8	4.4	4.4	43.6
Limited Eng, Prof	4						Limited Eng, Prof	4					
Non LEP	269	68.4	17.5	10	4.1	31.6	Non LEP	269	56.1	35.3	4.1	4.5	43.9
Subsidized Meals	230	72.2	17.4	8.3	2.2	27.8	Subsidized Meals	230	59.6	35.2	3	2.2	40.4
Full Pay Meals	43	46.5	18.6	20.9	14	53.5	Full Pay Meals	43	39.5	32.6	11.6	16.3	60.5

Grade 7

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	290	47.9	37.2	13.8	1	52.1	All Students	290	54.1	36.9	5.5	3.4	45.9
Male	151	55.6	31.8	11.3	1.3	44.4	Male	151	59.6	29.1	6	5.3	40.4
Female	139	39.6	43.2	16.5	0.7	60.4	Female	139	48.2	45.3	5	1.4	51.8
White	81	33.3	40.7	23.5	2.5	66.7	White	81	33.3	46.9	11.1	8.6	66.7
African American	198	53	35.9	10.6	0.5	47	African American	198	61.6	33.3	3.5	1.5	38.4
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	4						Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6						Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	93.3	6.7			6.7	Disabled	15	93.3	6.7			6.7
Not Disabled	275	45.5	38.9	14.5	1.1	54.5	Not Disabled	275	52	38.5	5.8	3.6	48
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	290	47.9	37.2	13.8	1	52.1	Non migrant	290	54.1	36.9	5.5	3.4	45.9
Limited Eng Prof	4						Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	286	47.6	37.4	14	1	52.4	Non LEP	286	54.2	36.7	5.6	3.5	45.8
Subsidized Meals	241	54.8	36.1	8.7	0.4	45.2	Subsidized Meals	241	59.8	34.4	3.7	2.1	40.2
Full Pay Meals	49	14.3	42.9	38.8	4.1	85.7	Full Pay Meals	49	26.5	49	14.3	10.2	73.5

REC038919

DEF_3319-0008

TEX_020985

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	290	60.3	30.7	5.9	3.1	39.7	All Students	289	57.8	33.6	5.5	3.1	42.2
Male	151	60.9	27.8	6.6	4.6	39.1	Male	151	58.9	29.8	6	5.3	41.1
Female	139	59.7	33.8	5	1.4	40.3	Female	138	56.5	37.7	5.1	0.7	43.5
White	81	40.7	39.5	9.9	9.9	59.3	White	81	37	44.4	12.3	6.2	63
African American	198	67.2	27.8	4.5	0.5	32.8	African American	197	66	28.9	3	2	34
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	4						Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6						Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	93.3	6.7			6.7	Disabled	15	86.7	13.3			13.3
Not Disabled	275	58.5	32	6.2	3.3	41.5	Not Disabled	274	56.2	34.7	5.8	3.3	43.8
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	290	60.3	30.7	5.9	3.1	39.7	Non migrant	289	57.8	33.6	5.5	3.1	42.2
Limited Eng Prof	4						Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	286	60.1	30.8	5.9	3.1	39.9	Non LEP	285	58.2	33	5.6	3.2	41.8
Subsidized Meals	241	66.4	27.8	5	0.8	33.6	Subsidized Meals	240	64.2	30.8	3.3	1.7	35.8
Full Pay Meals	49	30.6	44.9	10.2	14.3	69.4	Full Pay Meals	49	26.5	46.9	16.3	10.2	73.5

Grade 8

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	51.4	38.5	8.9	1.2	48.6	All Students	245	54.7	35.9	6.9	2.4	45.3
Male	118	56.8	37.3	5.1	0.8	43.2	Male	117	60.7	31.6	6	1.7	39.3
Female	129	46.5	39.5	12.4	1.6	53.5	Female	128	49.2	39.8	7.8	3.1	50.8

REC038920

DEF_3319-0009

TEX_020986

White	63	33.3	50.8	15.9		66.7	White	62	35.5	53.2	9.7	1.6	64.5
African American	173	56.6	34.7	6.9	1.7	43.4	African American	172	61	31.4	4.7	2.9	39
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6						Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4						Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	100					Disabled	13	92.3	7.7			7.7
Not Disabled	233	48.5	40.8	9.4	1.3	51.5	Not Disabled	232	52.6	37.5	7.3	2.6	47.4
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	247	51.4	38.5	8.9	1.2	48.6	Non migrant	245	54.7	35.9	6.9	2.4	45.3
Limited Eng Prof	5						Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	242	50.8	38.8	9.1	1.2	49.2	Non LEP	240	54.2	36.7	6.7	2.5	45.8
Subsidized Meals	207	56	37.2	6.3	0.5	44	Subsidized Meals	205	60	32.7	5.4	2	40
Full Pay Meals	40	27.5	45	22.5	5	72.5	Full Pay Meals	40	27.5	52.5	15	5	72.5

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	71.3	26.7	1.2	0.8	28.7
Male	120	73.3	23.3	2.5	0.8	26.7
Female	127	69.3	29.9		0.8	30.7
White	64	65.6	29.7	4.7		34.4
African American	172	72.1	26.7		1.2	27.9
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	100				
Not Disabled	233	69.5	28.3	1.3	0.9	30.5
Migrant						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	59.9	32.8	4.9	2.4	40.1
Male	118	60.2	29.7	6.8	3.4	39.8
Female	129	59.7	35.7	3.1	1.6	40.3
White	62	46.8	43.5	8.1	1.6	53.2
African American	174	63.8	29.9	3.4	2.9	36.2
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	92.9	7.1			7.1
Not Disabled	233	57.9	34.3	5.2	2.6	42.1
Migrant						

REC038921

DEF_3319-0010

TEX_020987

Dillon 2

Non migrant	247	71 3	26 7	1 2	0 8	28 7	Non migrant	247	59 9	32 8	4 9	2 4	40 1
Limited Eng Prof	5						Limited Eng Prof	5				2 5	40 5
Non LEP	242	70 7	27 3	1 2	0 8	29 3	Non-LEP	242	59 5	33 1	5	2 5	40 5
Subsidized Meals	207	72	26 1	1 4	0 5	28	Subsidized Meals	207	65 2	29 5	3 9	1 4	34 8
Full Pay Meals	40	67 5	30		2 5	32 5	Full Pay Meals	40	32 5	50	10	7 5	67 5

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

[top]

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders



| [Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:54:20AM from server web02

This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038922

DEF_3319-0011

TEX_020988

http://www.myscschools.com/tracks/testscores/pact/2004/show_district_pact_scores.cfm?ID=1690

9/8/2004

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP |

South Carolina Department of Education

[DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS](#) | [EDUCATORS](#) | [STUDENTS](#) | [PARENTS](#) | [SDE OFFICES](#) | [LEGISLATIVE](#)
[HOME PAGE](#) | [FINANCE](#) | [TEST SCORES](#) | [REPORTS](#) | [DOWNLOADS](#) | [STATE BOARD](#)

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\[return to main PACT Report page\]](#)
[\[return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page\]](#)

East Elementary - Dillon 2

Page Generated
 10 54 44
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for East Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	135	11.9	29.6	48.1	10.4	88.1	All Students	135	11.1	45.9	28.9	14.1	88.9
Male	68	14.7	29.4	44.1	11.8	85.3	Male	68	13.2	45.6	26.5	14.7	85.8
Female	67	9	29.9	52.2	9	91	Female	67	9	46.3	31.3	13.4	91
White	60	6.7	18.3	61.7	13.3	93.3	White	60	8.3	33.3	36.7	21.7	91.7
African American	64	14.1	34.4	42.2	9.4	85.9	African American	64	14.1	56.3	21.9	7.8	85.9
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	8						Hispanic	8					
Am Indian/Alaskan	2						Am Indian/Alaskan	2					
Disabled	13	23.1	53.8	15.4	7.7	76.9	Disabled	13	38.5	30.8	23.1	7.7	61.5
Not Disabled	122	10.7	27	51.6	10.7	89.3	Not Disabled	122	8.2	47.5	29.5	14.8	91.8

REC038923

DEF_3319-0012

TEX_020989

Dillon 2

Migrant						
Non migrant	135	11.9	29.6	48.1	10.4	88.1
Limited Eng Prof	6					
Non LEP	129	10.1	29.5	49.6	10.9	89.9
Subsidized Meals	101	14.9	36.6	40.6	7.9	85.1
Full Pay Meals	34	2.9	8.8	70.6	17.6	97.1

Migrant						
Non migrant	135	11.1	45.9	28.9	14.1	88.9
Limited Eng, Prof	6					
Non LEP	129	10.9	46.5	27.9	14.7	89.1
Subsidized Meals	101	11.9	54.5	20.8	12.9	88.1
Full Pay Meals	34	8.8	20.6	52.9	17.6	91.2

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	137	48.2	35	13.9	2.9	51.8
Male	70	44.3	41.4	8.6	5.7	55.7
Female	67	52.2	28.4	19.4		47.8
White	60	31.7	40	21.7	6.7	68.3
African American	65	60	30.8	9.2		40
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	8					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	15	60	33.3		6.7	40
Not Disabled	122	46.7	35.2	15.6	2.5	53.3
Migrant						
Non migrant	137	48.2	35	13.9	2.9	51.8
Limited Eng Prof	6					
Non LEP	131	48.9	33.6	14.5	3.1	51.1
Subsidized Meals	103	56.3	31.1	11.7	1	43.7
Full Pay Meals	34	23.5	47.1	20.6	8.8	76.5

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	137	27	54	12.4	6.6	73
Male	70	35.7	42.9	12.9	8.6	64.3
Female	67	17.9	65.7	11.9	4.5	82.1
White	60	16.7	58.3	18.3	6.7	83.3
African American	65	35.4	50.8	6.2	7.7	64.6
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	8					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	15	60	33.3	6.7		40
Not Disabled	122	23	56.6	13.1	7.4	77
Migrant						
Non migrant	137	27	54	12.4	6.6	73
Limited Eng, Prof	6					
Non LEP	131	27.5	54.2	11.5	6.9	72.5
Subsidized Meals	103	33	52.4	12.6	1.9	67
Full Pay Meals	34	8.8	58.8	11.8	20.6	91.2

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

REC038924

DEF_3319-0013

TEX_020990

- 1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade
- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

[Legal Info](#) ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |

This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:54:45AM from server web02



This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038925

DEF_3319-0014

TEX_020991

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | | BOE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAPI |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | BOE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\[return to main PACT Report page\]](#)
[\[return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page\]](#)

Gordon Elementary - Dillon 2

Page Generated
10 55 25
Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Gordon Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

English/Language Arts

Number Tested	%				% Meet Standard
	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	

- All Students
- Male
- Female
- White
- African American
- Asian/Pacific Is
- Hispanic
- Am Indian/Alaskan
- Disabled
- Not Disabled

Mathematics

Number Tested	%				% Meet Standard
	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	

- All Students
- Male
- Female
- White
- African American
- Asian/Pacific Is
- Hispanic
- Am Indian/Alaskan
- Disabled
- Not Disabled

REC038926

DEF_3319-0015

TEX_020992

Migrant
 Non migrant
 Limited Eng,
 Prof
 Non LEP
 Subsidized
 Meals
 Full Pay Meals

Migrant
 Non migrant
 Limited Eng,
 Prof
 Non LEP
 Subsidized
 Meals
 Full Pay Meals

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
--	---------------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	-----------------

All Students	1					
Male	1					
Female						
White						
African American						
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan	1					
Disabled	1					
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant	1					
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	1					
Subsidized Meals	1					
Full Pay Meals						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
--	---------------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	-----------------

All Students						
Male						
Female						
White						
African American						
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled						
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant						
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP						
Subsidized Meals						
Full Pay Meals						

Grade 4

REC038927

DEF_3319-0016

TEX_020993

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	274	36.9	39.8	22.6	0.7	63.1	All Students	277	36.1	36.8	17.7	9.4	63.9
Male	148	42.6	38.5	18.9		57.4	Male	150	41.3	34	15.3	9.3	58.7
Female	126	30.2	41.3	27	1.6	69.8	Female	127	29.9	40.2	20.5	9.4	70.1
White	66	18.2	31.8	50		81.8	White	67	19.4	37.3	23.9	19.4	80.6
African American	193	44	40.9	14	1	56	African American	194	41.8	36.6	16.5	5.2	58.2
Asian/Pacific Is	2						Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	4						Hispanic	5					
Am Indian/Alaskan	9						Am Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	24	62.5	25	12.5		37.5	Disabled	26	65.4	23.1	7.7	3.8	34.6
Not Disabled	250	34.4	41.2	23.6	0.8	65.6	Not Disabled	251	33.1	38.2	18.7	10	66.9
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	274	36.9	39.8	22.6	0.7	63.1	Non migrant	277	36.1	36.8	17.7	9.4	63.9
Limited Eng, Prof	5						Limited Eng Prof	6					
Non LEP	269	37.2	39.4	22.7	0.7	62.8	Non LEP	271	36.2	37.3	17.7	8.9	63.8
Subsidized Meals	234	40.6	40.2	18.8	0.4	59.4	Subsidized Meals	237	38.8	37.6	17.3	6.3	61.2
Full Pay Meals	40	15	37.5	45	2.5	85	Full Pay Meals	40	20	32.5	20	27.5	80
Science							Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	275	58.2	28.4	6.2	7.3	41.8	All Students	275	43.6	40.4	11.6	4.4	56.4
Male	148	60.1	27.7	5.4	6.8	39.9	Male	148	47.3	40.5	8.8	3.4	52.7
Female	127	55.9	29.1	7.1	7.9	44.1	Female	127	39.4	40.2	15	5.5	60.6
White	67	37.3	37.3	7.5	17.9	62.7	White	67	31.3	35.8	22.4	10.4	68.7
African American	193	64.8	26.4	5.7	3.1	35.2	African American	193	49.2	41.5	6.7	2.6	50.8
Asian/Pacific							Asian/Pacific						

REC038928

DEF_3319-0017

TEX_020994

Is	2					
Hispanic	4					
Am						
Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	25	68	32			32
Not Disabled	250	57 2	28	6 8	8	42 8
Migrant						
Non migrant	275	58 2	28 4	6 2	7 3	41 8
Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	270	58 5	28 5	5 9	7	41 5
Subsidized Meals	235	63	27 2	5 1	4 7	37
Full Pay Meals	40	30	35	12 5	22 5	70

Is	2					
Hispanic	4					
Am						
Indian/Alaskan	9					
Disabled	25	56	36	8		44
Not Disabled	250	42 4	40 8	12	4 8	57 6
Migrant						
Non migrant	275	43 6	40 4	11 6	4 4	56 4
Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	270	44 1	40 4	11 1	4 4	55 9
Subsidized Meals	235	47 2	40 9	9 8	2 1	52 8
Full Pay Meals	40	22 5	37 5	22 5	17 5	77 5

Grade 5

English/Language Arts						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	243	37	41 6	19 8	1 6	63
Male	134	48 5	34 3	15 7	1 5	51 5
Female	109	22 9	50 5	24 8	1 8	77 1
White	63	17 5	39 7	39 7	3 2	82 5
African American	168	44	41 1	13 7	1 2	56
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	2					
Am						
Indian/Alaskan	10	40	60			60
Disabled	14	85 7	14 3			14 3
Not Disabled	229	34 1	43 2	21	1 7	65 9
Migrant						

Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	246	36 6	41 5	13 8	8 1	63 4
Male	134	37 3	42 5	10 4	9 7	62 7
Female	112	35 7	40 2	17 9	6 3	64 3
White	63	15 9	44 4	19	20 6	84 1
African American	169	43 8	40 2	13	3	56 2
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	4					
Am						
Indian/Alaskan	10	30	50		20	70
Disabled	15	73 3	20	6 7		26 7
Not Disabled	231	34 2	42 9	14 3	8 7	65 8
Migrant						

REC038929

DEF_3319-0018

TEX_020995

Dillon 2

Science							Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
Non migrant	243	37	41 6	19 8	1 6	63	Non migrant	246	36 6	41 5	13 8	8 1	63 4
Limited Eng, Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	3					
Non LEP	242	37 2	41 3	19 8	1 7	62 8	Non LEP	243	36 2	41 6	14	8 2	63 8
Subsidized Meals	206	39 3	43 2	16 5	1	60 7	Subsidized Meals	209	40 7	41 6	12	5 7	59 3
Full Pay Meals	37	24 3	32 4	37 8	5 4	75 7	Full Pay Meals	37	13 5	40 5	24 3	21 6	86 5
All Students	243	65 4	22 6	7	4 9	34 6	All Students	243	61 7	28 4	5 8	4 1	38 3
Male	134	67 2	20 9	7 5	4 5	32 8	Male	134	64 9	27 6	3	4 5	35 1
Female	109	63 3	24 8	6 4	5 5	36 7	Female	109	57 8	29 4	9 2	3 7	42 2
White	63	42 9	28 6	14 3	14 3	57 1	White	63	42 9	36 5	12 7	7 9	57 1
African American	168	73 2	20 2	4 8	1 8	26 8	African American	168	67 9	26 2	3	3	32 1
Asian/Pacific Is	2						Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	2						Hispanic	2					
Am Indian/Alaskan	10	80	20			20	Am Indian/Alaskan	10	70	20	10		30
Disabled	14	92 9	7 1			7 1	Disabled	14	100				
Not Disabled	229	63 8	23 6	7 4	5 2	36 2	Not Disabled	229	59 4	30 1	6 1	4 4	40 6
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	243	65 4	22 6	7	4 9	34 6	Non migrant	243	61 7	28 4	5 8	4 1	38 3
Limited Eng Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	242	65 7	22 3	7	5	34 3	Non LEP	242	61 6	28 5	5 8	4 1	38 4
Subsidized Meals	206	69 4	22 3	5 8	2 4	30 6	Subsidized Meals	206	65	28 2	4 9	1 9	35
Full Pay Meals	37	43 2	24 3	13 5	18 9	56 8	Full Pay Meals	37	43 2	29 7	10 8	16 2	56 8

Grade 6

REC038930

DEF_3319-0019

TEX_020996

	English/Language Arts					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	51.6	34.4	11.4	2.6	48.4
Male	135	57	30.4	11.9	0.7	43
Female	138	46.4	38.4	10.9	4.3	53.6
White	85	44.7	32.9	17.6	4.7	55.3
African American	180	54.4	35.6	8.9	1.1	45.6
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	50.4	35.2	11.7	2.7	49.6
Migrant						
Non migrant	273	51.6	34.4	11.4	2.6	48.4
Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	269	51.7	34.6	11.5	2.2	48.3
Subsidized Meals	230	56.1	34.3	7.8	1.7	43.9
Full Pay Meals	43	27.9	34.9	30.2	7	72.1

	Science					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	68.1	17.6	10.3	4	31.9
Male	135	64.4	17.8	14.1	3.7	35.6
Female	138	71.7	17.4	6.5	4.3	28.3
White	85	55.3	20	15.3	9.4	44.7
African American	180	73.9	16.7	7.8	1.7	26.1
Asian/Pacific						

	Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	30.8	44	19	6.2	69.2
Male	135	34.8	39.3	22.2	3.7	65.2
Female	138	26.8	48.6	15.9	8.7	73.2
White	85	30.6	31.8	22.4	15.3	69.4
African American	180	30.6	50	17.8	1.7	69.4
Asian/Pacific Is	2					
Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	30.7	43.9	18.9	6.4	69.3
Migrant						
Non migrant	273	30.8	44	19	6.2	69.2
Limited Eng, Prof	4					
Non LEP	269	31.2	43.9	19	5.9	68.8
Subsidized Meals	230	33	45.7	17.4	3.9	67
Full Pay Meals	43	18.6	34.9	27.9	18.6	81.4

	Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	273	56.4	34.8	4.4	4.4	43.6
Male	135	57.8	34.1	5.2	3	42.2
Female	138	55.1	35.5	3.6	5.8	44.9
White	85	51.8	32.9	8.2	7.1	48.2
African American	180	57.2	37.2	2.2	3.3	42.8
Asian/Pacific						

REC038931

DEF_3319-0020

TEX_020997

Is	2						Is	2					
Hispanic	3						Hispanic	3					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3						Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	9						Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	264	67.4	17.8	10.6	4.2	32.6	Not Disabled	264	56.1	34.8	4.5	4.5	43.9
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	273	68.1	17.6	10.3	4	31.9	Non migrant	273	56.4	34.8	4.4	4.4	43.6
Limited Eng, Prof	4						Limited Eng, Prof	4					
Non LEP	269	68.4	17.5	10	4.1	31.6	Non LEP	269	56.1	35.3	4.1	4.5	43.9
Subsidized Meals	230	72.2	17.4	8.3	2.2	27.8	Subsidized Meals	230	59.6	35.2	3	2.2	40.4
Full Pay Meals	43	46.5	18.6	20.9	14	53.5	Full Pay Meals	43	39.5	32.6	11.6	16.3	60.5

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

- 1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade
- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

| [Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
 This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:55:26AM from server web02



This page
 is Bobby Approved

REC038932

DEF_3319-0021

TEX_020998

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP!!

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\[return to main PACT Report page\]](#)
[\[return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page\]](#)

J V Martin Junior High - Dillon 2

Page Generated
 10 55 46
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for J V Martin Junior High

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

English/Language Arts

Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
---------------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	-----------------

All Students
 Male
 Female
 White
 African American
 Asian/Pacific Is
 Hispanic
 Am Indian/Alaskan
 Disabled
 Not Disabled

Mathematics

Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
---------------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	-----------------

All Students 1
 Male 1
 Female
 White
 African American 1
 Asian/Pacific Is
 Hispanic
 Am Indian/Alaskan
 Disabled 1
 Not Disabled

REC038933

DEF_3319-0022

TEX_020999

Migrant
 Non migrant
 Limited Eng
 Prof
 Non LEP
 Subsidized
 Meals
 Full Pay Meals

Migrant
 Non migrant 1
 Limited Eng
 Prof
 Non LEP 1
 Subsidized
 Meals 1
 Full Pay Meals

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	2					
Male	2					
Female						
White						
African American	2					
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	1					
Not Disabled	1					
Migrant						
Non migrant	2					
Limited Eng, Prof						
Non LEP	2					
Subsidized Meals	2					
Full Pay Meals						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	1					
Male	1					
Female						
White						
African American	1					
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	1					
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant	1					
Limited Eng, Prof						
Non LEP	1					
Subsidized Meals	1					
Full Pay Meals						

Grade 7

REC038934

DEF_3319-0023

TEX_021000

English/Language Arts

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	290	47.9	37.2	13.8	1	52.1
Male	151	55.6	31.8	11.3	1.3	44.4
Female	139	39.6	43.2	16.5	0.7	60.4
White	81	33.3	40.7	23.5	2.5	66.7
African American	198	53	35.9	10.6	0.5	47
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	93.3	6.7			6.7
Not Disabled	275	45.5	38.9	14.5	1.1	54.5
Migrant						
Non migrant	290	47.9	37.2	13.8	1	52.1
Limited Eng, Prof	4					
Non LEP	286	47.6	37.4	14	1	52.4
Subsidized Meals	241	54.8	36.1	8.7	0.4	45.2
Full Pay Meals	49	14.3	42.9	38.8	4.1	85.7

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	290	60.3	30.7	5.9	3.1	39.7
Male	151	60.9	27.8	6.6	4.6	39.1
Female	139	59.7	33.8	5	1.4	40.3
White	81	40.7	39.5	9.9	9.9	59.3
African American	198	67.2	27.8	4.5	0.5	32.8
Asian/Pacific						

Mathematics

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	290	54.1	36.9	5.5	3.4	45.9
Male	151	59.6	29.1	6	5.3	40.4
Female	139	48.2	45.3	5	1.4	51.8
White	81	33.3	46.9	11.1	8.6	66.7
African American	198	61.6	33.3	3.5	1.5	38.4
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	93.3	6.7			6.7
Not Disabled	275	52	38.5	5.8	3.6	48
Migrant						
Non migrant	290	54.1	36.9	5.5	3.4	45.9
Limited Eng, Prof	4					
Non LEP	286	54.2	36.7	5.6	3.5	45.8
Subsidized Meals	241	59.8	34.4	3.7	2.1	40.2
Full Pay Meals	49	26.5	49	14.3	10.2	73.5

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	289	57.8	33.6	5.5	3.1	42.2
Male	151	58.9	29.8	6	5.3	41.1
Female	138	56.5	37.7	5.1	0.7	43.5
White	81	37	44.4	12.3	6.2	63
African American	197	66	28.9	3	2	34
Asian/Pacific						

REC038935

DEF_3319-0024

TEX_021001

Is	1					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	93 3	6 7		6 7	
Not Disabled	275	58 5	32 6 2	3 3	41 5	
Migrant						
Non migrant	290	60 3	30 7 5 9	3 1	39 7	
Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	286	60 1	30 8 5 9	3 1	39 9	
Subsidized Meals	241	66 4	27 8 5	0 8	33 6	
Full Pay Meals	49	30 6	44 9 10 2	14 3	69 4	

Is	1					
Hispanic	4					
Am Indian/Alaskan	6					
Disabled	15	86 7	13 3		13 3	
Not Disabled	274	56 2	34 7 5 8	3 3	43 8	
Migrant						
Non migrant	289	57 8	33 6 5 5	3 1	42 2	
Limited Eng Prof	4					
Non LEP	285	58 2	33 5 6	3 2	41 8	
Subsidized Meals	240	64 2	30 8 3 3	1 7	35 8	
Full Pay Meals	49	26 5	46 9 16 3	10 2	73 5	

Grade 8

English/Language Arts

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	51 4	38 5	8 9	1 2	48 6
Male	118	56 8	37 3	5 1	0 8	43 2
Female	129	46 5	39 5	12 4	1 6	53 5
White	63	33 3	50 8	15 9		66 7
African American	173	56 6	34 7	6 9	1 7	43 4
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	100				
Not Disabled	233	48 5	40 8	9 4	1 3	51 5
Migrant						

Mathematics

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	245	54 7	35 9	6 9	2 4	45 3
Male	117	60 7	31 6	6	1 7	39 3
Female	128	49 2	39 8	7 8	3 1	50 8
White	62	35 5	53 2	9 7	1 6	64 5
African American	172	61	31 4	4 7	2 9	39
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	13	92 3	7 7			7 7
Not Disabled	232	52 6	37 5	7 3	2 6	47 4
Migrant						

REC038936

DEF_3319-0025

TEX_021002

Non migrant	247	51.4	38.5	8.9	1.2	48.6	Non migrant	245	54.7	35.9	6.9	2.4	45.3
Limited Eng Prof	5						Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	242	50.8	38.8	9.1	1.2	49.2	Non LEP	240	54.2	36.7	6.7	2.5	45.8
Subsidized Meals	207	56	37.2	6.3	0.5	44	Subsidized Meals	205	60	32.7	5.4	2	40
Full Pay Meals	40	27.5	45	22.5	5	72.5	Full Pay Meals	40	27.5	52.5	15	5	72.5

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	71.3	26.7	1.2	0.8	28.7
Male	120	73.3	23.3	2.5	0.8	26.7
Female	127	69.3	29.9		0.8	30.7
White	64	65.6	29.7	4.7		34.4
African American	172	72.1	26.7		1.2 ¹	27.9
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	100				
Not Disabled	233	69.5	28.3	1.3	0.9	30.5
Migrant						
Non migrant	247	71.3	26.7	1.2	0.8	28.7
Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	242	70.7	27.5	1.2	0.8	29.3
Subsidized Meals	207	72	26.1	1.4	0.5	28
Full Pay Meals	40	67.5	30		2.5	32.5

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	247	59.9	32.8	4.9	2.4	40.1
Male	118	60.2	29.7	6.8	3.4	39.8
Female	129	59.7	35.7	3.1	1.6	40.3
White	62	46.8	43.5	8.1	1.6	53.2
African American	174	63.8	29.9	3.4	2.9	36.2
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic	6					
Am Indian/Alaskan	4					
Disabled	14	92.9	7.1			7.1
Not Disabled	233	57.9	34.3	5.2	2.6	42.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	247	59.9	32.8	4.9	2.4	40.1
Limited Eng Prof	5					
Non LEP	242	59.5	33.1	5	2.5	40.5
Subsidized Meals	207	65.2	29.5	3.9	1.4	34.8
Full Pay Meals	40	32.5	50	10	7.5	67.5

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade

REC038937

DEF_3319-0026

TEX_021003

- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

| [Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
 This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:55:47AM from server web02



This page is Bobby Approved

REC038938

DEF_3319-0027

TEX_021004

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP |

South Carolina Department of Education

DEPARTMENTS

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[return to main PACT Report page]
 [return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page]

South Elementary - Dillon 2

Page Generated
 10 55 59
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for South Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	55	18.2	21.8	50.9	9.1	81.8	All Students	55	9.1	34.5	41.8	14.5	90.9
Male	30	30	20	40	10	70	Male	30	16.7	36.7	40	6.7	83.3
Female	25	4	24	64	8	96	Female	25		32	44	24	100
White	14	21.4	7.1	50	21.4	78.6	White	14	7.1	28.6	57.1	7.1	92.9
African American	39	15.4	25.6	53.8	5.1	84.6	African American	39	7.7	38.5	38.5	15.4	92.3
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan	2						Am Indian/Alaskan	2					
Disabled	9						Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	46	13	21.7	56.5	8.7	87	Not Disabled	46	6.5	37	41.3	15.2	93.5

REC038939

DEF_3319-0028

TEX_021005

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
Migrant						
Non migrant	55	18.2	21.8	50.9	9.1	81.8
Limited Eng, Prof						
Non LEP	55	18.2	21.8	50.9	9.1	81.8
Subsidized Meals	50	20	20	52	8	80
Full Pay Meals	5					
Science						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	55	20	52.7	27.3		80
Male	30	33.3	40	26.7		66.7
Female	25	4	68	28		96
White	14	28.6	7.1	64.3		71.4
African American	39	15.4	69.2	15.4		84.6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan	2					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	46	15.2	56.5	28.3		84.8
Migrant						
Non migrant	55	20	52.7	27.3		80
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	55	20	52.7	27.3		80
Subsidized Meals	50	22	54	24		78
Full-Pay Meals	5					

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
Migrant						
Non migrant	55	9.1	34.5	41.8	14.5	90.9
Limited Eng, Prof						
Non LEP	55	9.1	34.5	41.8	14.5	90.9
Subsidized Meals	50	10	32	42	16	90
Full Pay Meals	5					
Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	55	29.1	63.6	5.5	1.8	70.9
Male	30	33.3	63.3	3.3		66.7
Female	25	24	64	8	4	76
White	14	21.4	57.1	14.3	7.1	78.6
African American	39	30.8	66.7	2.6		69.2
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan	2					
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	46	23.9	69.6	4.3	2.2	76.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	55	29.1	63.6	5.5	1.8	70.9
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	55	29.1	63.6	5.5	1.8	70.9
Subsidized Meals	50	28	66	4	2	72
Full Pay Meals	5					

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

REC038940

DEF_3319-0029
TEX_021006

- 1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade
- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10 55 59AM from server web02



This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038941

DEF_3319-0030

TEX_021007

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP! |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES? | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

SC Department of Education | Search the Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[\[return to main PACT Report page\]](#)
[\[return to main Dillon 2 PACT Report page\]](#)

Stewart Heights Elementary - Dillon 2

Page Generated
 10 56 12
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Stewart Heights Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	98	20 4	38 8	33 7	7 1	79 6	All Students	98	17 3	62 2	16 3	4 1	82 7
Male	45	22 2	48 9	24 4	4 4	77 8	Male	45	24 4	62 2	11 1	2 2	75 6
Female	53	18 9	30 2	41 5	9 4	81 1	Female	53	11 3	62 3	20 8	5 7	88 7
White	7						White	7					
African American	87	20 7	42 5	29 9	6 9	79 3	African American	87	18 4	63 2	13 8	4 6	81 6
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3						Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	11	72 7	18 2		9 1	27 3	Disabled	11	54 5	36 4		9 1	45 5
Not Disabled	87	13 8	41 4	37 9	6 9	86 2	Not Disabled	87	12 6	65 5	18 4	3 4	87 4

REC038942

DEF_3319-0031

TEX_021008

		Science				
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
Migrant						
Non migrant	98	20.4	38.8	33.7	7.1	79.6
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	97	20.6	39.2	33	7.2	79.4
Subsidized Meals	91	19.8	40.7	35.2	4.4	80.2
Full Pay Meals	7					
All Students	100	58	38	3	1	42
Male	46	56.5	41.3		2.2	43.5
Female	54	59.3	35.2	5.6		40.7
White	7					
African American	89	61.8	34.8	2.2	1.1	38.2
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	13	76.9	15.4		7.7	23.1
Not Disabled	87	55.2	41.4	3.4		44.8
Migrant						
Non migrant	100	58	38	3	1	42
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	99	58.6	37.4	3	1	41.4
Subsidized Meals	93	60.2	36.6	3.2		39.8
Full Pay Meals	7					

		Social Studies				
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
Migrant						
Non migrant	98	17.3	62.2	16.3	4.1	82.7
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	97	17.5	62.9	15.5	4.1	82.5
Subsidized Meals	91	17.6	64.8	15.4	2.2	82.4
Full Pay Meals	7					
All Students	100	57	41	2		43
Male	46	65.2	32.6	2.2		34.8
Female	54	50	48.1	1.9		50
White	7					
African American	89	59.6	38.2	2.2		40.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan	3					
Disabled	13	84.6	7.7	7.7		15.4
Not Disabled	87	52.9	46	1.1		47.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	100	57	41	2		43
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	99	57.6	40.4	2		42.4
Subsidized Meals	93	57	41.9	1.1		43
Full Pay Meals	7					

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

REC038943

DEF_3319-0032

TEX_021009

- 1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade
- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10 56 13AM from server web02



This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038944

DEF_3319-0033
TEX_021010

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT | | SDG WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAP! |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDG OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD



Bookmark This Page Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By District

[return to main PACT Report page]
 [return to main Florence 4 PACT Report page]

Florence 4

Page Generated
 10:56:35
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Florence 4

All Student Scores by Grade

English/Language Arts							Mathematics						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	73	24.7	34.2	38.4	2.7	75.3	3	75	32	54.7	10.7	2.7	68
4	80	58.8	35	5	1.3	41.3	4	84	58.3	34.5	7.1		41.7
5	81	29.6	59.3	11.1		70.4	5	82	40.2	46.3	7.3	6.1	59.8
6	65	43.1	41.5	15.4		56.9	6	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
7	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	7	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
8	74	48.6	50	1.4		51.4	8	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	1.4	45.9
Science							Social Studies						
Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Grade	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
3	82	65.9	29.3	4.0		34.1	3	80	47.5	41.3	10	1.3	52.5
4	86	80.2	17.4	2.3		19.8	4	85	69.4	27.1	3.5		30.6
5	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4	5	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
6	73	61.6	32.9		5.5	38.4	6	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
7	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	7	70	71.4	28.6			28.6

REC038945

DEF_3320

TEX_021011

8 78 78 2 20 5 1 3 21 8 6 78 73 1 23 1 3 8 26 9

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	73	24.7	34.2	38.4	2.7	75.3	All Students	75	32	54.7	10.7	2.7	68
Male	40	27.5	35	35	2.5	72.5	Male	43	34.9	51.2	14		65.1
Female	33	21.2	33.3	42.4	3	78.8	Female	32	28.1	59.4	6.3	6.3	71.0
White	6						White	7					
African American	66	22.7	34.8	39.4	3	77.3	African American	57	31.3	55.2	10.4	3	68.7
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	10	50	40	10		50	Disabled	12	75	25			25
Not Disabled	63	20.6	33.3	42.9	3.2	79.4	Not Disabled	63	23.8	60.3	12.7	3.2	76.2
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	73	24.7	34.2	38.4	2.7	75.3	Non migrant	75	32	54.7	10.7	2.7	68
Limited Eng, Prof	1						Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	72	25	33.3	38.9	2.8	75	Non LEP	74	32.4	54.1	10.8	2.7	67.6
Subsidized Meals	68	25	36.8	36.8	1.5	75	Subsidized Meals	70	34.3	54.3	10	1.4	65.7
Full Pay Meals	5						Full Pay Meals	5					

REC038946

DEF_3320-0002

TEX_021012

Florence 4

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	82	65.9	29.3	4.9		34.1	All Students	80	47.5	41.3	10	1.3	52.5
Male	47	63.8	29.8	6.4		36.2	Male	45	52.2	39.1	8.7		47.8
Female	35	68.6	28.6	2.9		31.4	Female	34	41.2	44.1	11.8	2.9	58.8
White	8						White	8					
African American	73	63	31.5	5.5		37	African American	71	43.7	45.1	9.9	1.4	56.3
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	19	94.7	5.3			5.3	Disabled	17	82.4	17.6			17.6
Not Disabled	63	57.1	36.5	6.3		42.9	Not Disabled	63	38.1	47.6	12.7	1.6	61.9
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	82	65.9	29.3	4.9		34.1	Non migrant	80	47.5	41.3	10	1.3	52.5
Limited Eng, Prof	1						Limited Eng, Prof	1					
Non LEP	82	65.4	29.6	4.9		34.6	Non LEP	79	46.8	41.8	10.1	1.3	53.2
Subsidized Meals	77	67.5	28.6	3.9		32.5	Subsidized Meals	75	49.3	41.3	9.3		50.7
Full Pay Meals	5						Full Pay Meals	5					

Grade 4

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	80	58.8	35	5	1.3	41.3	All Students	84	58.3	34.5	7.1		41.7
Male	44	63.6	31.8	4.5		36.4	Male	47	59.6	34	6.4		40.4
Female	34	52.9	38.2	5.9	2.9	47.1	Female	35	54.3	37.1	8.6		45.7

REC038947

DEF_3320-0003

TEX_021013

White	7					
African American	71	59 2	35 2	4 2	1 4	40 8
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	4					
Not Disabled	76	57 9	35 5	5 3	1 3	42 1
Migrant						
Non migrant	80	58 8	35	5	1 3	41 3
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	80	58 8	35	5	1 3	41 3
Subsidized Meals	66	60 6	34 8	3	1 5	39 4
Full Pay Meals	14	50	25 7	14 3		50

White	9					
African American	73	58 9	35 6	5 5		41 1
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	77	55 8	37 7	6 5		44 2
Migran						
Non migrant	84	58 3	34 5	7 1		41 7
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	84	58 3	34 5	7 1		41 7
Subsidized Meals	70	57 1	35 7	7 1		42 9
Full Pay Meals	14	64 3	28 6	7 1		35 7

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	86	80 2	17 4	2 3		19 8
Male	50	82	18			18
Female	34	79 4	14 7	5 9		20 6
White	10	80	20			20
African American	74	81 1	16 2	2 7		18 9
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	11	90 9	9 1			9 1
Not Disabled	75	78 7	18 7	2 7		21 3
Migrant						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	85	69 4	27 1	3 5		30 6
Male	49	67 3	30 6	2		32 7
Female	34	70 6	23 5	5 9		29 4
White	10	60	20	20		40
African American	73	69 9	28 8	1 4		30 1
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	10	70	20	10		30
Not Disabled	75	69 3	28	2 7		30 7
Migrant						

REC038948

DEF_3320-0004

TEX_021014

Non migrant	86	80 2	17 4	2 3	19 8	Non migrant	85	69 4	27 1	3 5	30 6
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	86	80 2	17 4	2 3	19 8	Non LEP	85	69 4	27 1	3 5	30 6
Subsidized Meals	72	80 6	16 7	2 8	19 4	Subsidized Meals	71	69	28 2	2 8	31
Full Pay Meals	14	78 6	21 4		21 4	Full Pay Meals	14	71 4	21 4	7 1	28 6

Grade 5

English/Language Arts						Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard
All Students	81	29 6	59 3	11 1	70 4	All Students	82	40 2	46 3	7 3	6 1
Male	41	39	51 2	9 8	61	Male	42	38 1	42 9	9 5	9 5
Female	38	48 4	66 4	13 2	81 6	Female	38	42 1	50	5 3	2 6
White	11	18 2	72 7	9 1	81 8	White	11	27 3	54 5	9 1	9 1
African American	57	31 3	58 2	10 4	68 7	African American	68	42 6	45 6	7 4	4 4
Asian/Pacific Is	1					Asian/Pacific Is	1				
Hispanic						Hispanic					
Am Indian/Alaskan						Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	3					Disabled	4				
Not Disabled	78	29 5	59	11 5	70 5	Not Disabled	78	39 7	46 2	7 7	6 4
Migrant						Migrant					
Non migrant	81	29 6	59 3	11 1	70 4	Non migrant	82	40 2	46 3	7 3	6 1
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	81	29 6	59 3	11 1	70 4	Non LEP	82	40 2	46 3	7 3	6 1
Subsidized Meals	71	28 2	62	9 9	71 8	Subsidized Meals	72	40 3	47 2	6 9	5 6
Full Pay Meals	10	40	40	20	60	Full Pay Meals	10	40	40	10	10

REC038949

DEF_3320-0005

TEX_021015

	Science							Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4	All Students	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Male	47	72.3	19.6	6.4	2.1	27.7	Male	48	50.0	43.8	4.2	2.1	50.0
Female	45	82.2	15.6	2.2		17.8	Female	45	71.1	24.4	4.4		28.9
White	12	58.3	16.7	2.5		41.7	White	12	33.3	58.3	8.3		65.7
African American	79	81.0	17.7		1.3	19.0	African American	80	65.0	31.3	2.5	1.3	35.0
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	16	93.8	6.3			6.3	Disabled	17	58.8	41.2			41.2
Not Disabled	78	73.1	20.5	5.1	1.3	26.9	Not Disabled	78	61.5	32.1	5.1	1.3	38.5
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4	Non migrant	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng, Prof						
Non LEP	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4	Non LEP	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Subsidized Meals	83	78.3	16.9	4.8		21.7	Subsidized Meals	84	60.7	34.5	4.8		39.3
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	27.3		9.1	36.4	Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	27.3		9.1	36.4

Grade 6

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	65	43.1	41.5	15.4		56.9	All Students	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
Male	27	48.1	44.4	7.4		51.9	Male	29	24.1	41.4	20.7	13.8	75.9
Female	38	39.5	39.5	21.1		60.5	Female	38	7.9	55.3	28.9	7.9	92.1

REC038950

DEF_3320-0006

TEX_021016

White	14	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	White	15	20	40	26.7	13.3	80
African American	5	43.1	41.2	15.7	56.9	African American	52	13.5	51.9	25	9.6	86.5
Asian/Pacific Is						Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	6					Disabled	7					
Not Disabled	59	42.4	40.7	16.9	57.6	Not Disabled	60	11.7	50	28.3	10	88.3
Migrant						Migrant						
Non migrant	65	43.1	41.5	15.4	56.9	Non migrant	57	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	65	43.1	41.5	15.4	56.9	Non LEP	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
Subsidized Meals	51	47.1	39.2	13.7	52.9	Subsidized Meals	53	17	49.1	24.5	9.4	83
Full Pay Meals	14	28.6	50	21.4	71.4	Full Pay Meals	14	7.1	50	28.6	14.3	92.9

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	73	61.6	32.9		5.5	38.4
Male	32	68.8	21.9		9.4	31.3
Female	41	56.1	41.5		2.4	43.9
White	16	62.5	18.8		18.8	37.5
African American	57	61.4	36.8		1.8	38.6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	12	91.7	8.3			8.3
Not Disabled	61	55.7	37.7		6.6	44.3
Migrant						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Male	33	63.6	24.2	9.1	3	36.4
Female	41	58.3	29.3	2.4		31.7
White	16	56.3	18.8	18.8	6.3	43.8
African American	58	69	29.3	1.7		31
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	13	76.9	23.1			23.1
Not Disabled	61	63.9	27.9	6.6	1.6	36.1
Migrant						

REC038951

DEF_3320-0007

TEX_021017

Florence 4

Non migrant	73	61.6	32.9	5.5	38.4	Non migrant	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	73	61.6	32.9	5.5	38.4	Non LEP	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Subsidized Meals	58	65.5	29.3	5.2	34.5	Subsidized Meals	59	71.2	22	5.1	1.7	28.8
Full Pay Meals	15	46.7	46.7	6.7	53.3	Full Pay Meals	15	46.7	46.7	6.7		53.3

Grade 7

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	All Students	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Male	33	63.6	50.3	6.1		36.4	Male	33	60.6	33.3	3	3	39.4
Female	37	21.6	51.4	27		78.4	Female	37	37.9	35.1	24.3	2.7	62.2
White	6						White	6					
African American	64	42.2	40.6	17.2		57.8	African American	64	46.9	35.9	14.1	3.1	53.1
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	3						Disabled	3					
Not Disabled	67	38.8	4	3	17.9	61.2	Not Disabled	67	49.3	32.8	14.9	3	50.7
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	Non migrant	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	Non LEP	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Subsidized Meals	53	43.4	41.5	15.1		56.6	Subsidized Meals	53	50.9	37.7	11.3		49.1
Full Pay Meals	17	35.3	41.2	23.5		64.7	Full Pay Meals	17	41.2	23.5	23.5	11.8	58.8

REC038952

DEF_3320-0008

TEX_021018

	Science						Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	All Students	70	71.4	28.6		28.6
Male	34	73.5	17.6	5.9	2.9	26.5	Male	33	75.8	24.2		24.2
Female	37	48.6	35.1	5.4	10.8	51.4	Female	37	67.6	32.4		32.4
White	6						White	0				
African American	65	61.5	26.2	4.6	7.7	38.5	African American	64	71.9	28.1		28.1
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic							Hispanic					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	4						Disabled	3				
Not Disabled	67	58.2	28.4	6	7.5	41.8	Not Disabled	67	70.1	29.9		29.9
Migrant							Migrant					
Non migrant	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	Non migrant	70	71.4	28.6		28.6
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	Non LEP	70	71.4	28.6		28.6
Subsidized Meals	54	68.5	24	5.6	1.9	31.5	Subsidized Meals	53	79.2	20.8		20.8
Full Pay Meals	17	35.3	35.3	5.9	23.5	64.7	Full Pay Meals	17	47.1	52.9		52.9

Grade 8

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	74	48.6	50	1.4		51.4	All Students	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	45.9
Male	37	51.4	48.6			48.6	Male	37	45.9	51.4	2.7	54.1
Female	37	45.9	51.4	2.7		54.1	Female	37	62.2	35.1	2.7	37.3

REC038953

DEF_3320-0009

TEX_021019

Florence 4

White	9					
African American	64	53.1	46.9		46.9	
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	4					
Not Disabled	70	50	48.6	1.4	50	
Migrant						
Non migrant	74	48.6	50	1.4	51.4	
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	74	48.6	50	1.4	51.4	
Subsidized Meals	63	45	52.4	1.6	54	
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	35.4		36.4	

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	78	78.2	20.5	1.3		21.8
Male	40	72.5	27.5			27.5
Female	38	84.2	13.2	2.6		15.8
White	10	50	50			50
African American	67	83.6	16.4			16.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	69	78.3	20.3	1.4		21.7
Migrant						

White	9					
African American	64	59.4	39.1	1.6		40.6
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	4					
Not Disabled	70	52.9	44.3	1.4	1.4	47.1
Migrant						
Non migrant	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	1.4	45.9
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	74	54	43.2	1.4	1.4	45.9
Subsidized Meals	63	52.4	44.4	1.6	1.6	47.6
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	36.4			36.4

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	78	73	23.1	3.8		26.9
Male	40	80	15	5		20
Female	38	65.8	31.6	2.6		34.2
White	10	50	30	20		50
African American	67	77.6	20.9	1.5		22.4
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	9					
Not Disabled	69	72.5	24.6	2.9		27.5
Migrant						

REC038954

DEF_3320-0010

TEX_021020

Non migrant	78	78 2	20 5	1 3	21 8	Non migrant	78	73 1	23 1	3 8	26 9
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	78	78 2	20 5	1 3	21 8	Non LEP	78	73 1	23 1	3 8	26 9
Subsidized Meals	66	81 8	16 7	1 5	18 2	Subsidized Meals	66	74 2	22 7	3	25 8
Full Pay Meals	12	58 3	41 7		41 7	Full Pay Meals	12	66 7	25	8 3	33 2

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

[\[top\]](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

[Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySCGov.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |

This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 0 56 39AM from server web02



This page is Bobby Approved

REC038955

DEF_3320-0011

TEX_021021

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAPI |

South Carolina Department of Education

CONSTRUCTORS & SCHOOLS | EDUCATORS | STUDENTS | PARENTS | SDE OFFICES | LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE | FINANCE | TEST SCORES | REPORTS | DOWNLOADS | STATE BOARD

Bookmark This Page | Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[return to main PACT Report page]
 [return to main Florence 4 PACT Report page]

Brockington Elementary - Florence 4

Page Generated
 0 16 59
 Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Brockington Elementary

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

	English/Language Arts						Mathematics						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	73	24.7	34.2	38.4	2.7	75.3	All Students	75	32	54.7	10.7	2.7	68
Male	40	27.5	35	35	2.5	72.5	Male	43	34.9	51.2	14		65.1
Female	33	21.2	33.3	42.4	3	78.8	Female	32	28.1	59.4	6.3	6.3	71.9
White	6						White	7					
African American	66	22.7	34.8	39.4	3	77.3	African American	67	31.3	55.2	10.4	3	68.7
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	10	50	40	10		50	Disabled	12	75	25			25
Not Disabled	63	20.6	33.3	42.9	3.2	79.4	Not Disabled	63	23.8	60.3	12.7	3.2	76.2

REC038956

DEF_3320-0012

TEX_021022

Migrant						
Non migrant	73	24.7	34.2	38.4	2.7	75.3
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	72	25	33.3	38.9	2.8	75
Subsidized Meals	68	25	36.8	36.8	1.5	75
Full Pay Meals	5					

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	81	65.4	29.6	4.9		34.6
Male	47	63.8	29.8	6.4		36.2
Female	34	67.6	29.4	2.9		32.4
White	8					
African American	72	62.5	31.9	5.6		37.5
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	18	94.4	5.6			5.6
Not Disabled	63	57.1	35.5	6.3		42.9
Migrant						
Non migrant	81	65.4	29.6	4.9		34.6
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	80	65	30	5		35
Subsidized Meals	76	67.1	28.9	3.9		32.9
Full Pay Meals	5					

Migrant						
Non migrant	75	32	54.7	10.7	2.7	68
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	74	32.4	54.1	10.8	2.7	67.6
Subsidized Meals	70	34.3	54.3	10	1.4	65.7
Full Pay Meals	5					

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	80	47.5	41.3	10	1.3	52.5
Male	46	52.2	39.1	8.7		47.8
Female	34	41.2	44.1	11.8	2.9	58.8
White	8					
African American	71	43.7	45.1	9.9	1.4	56.3
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	17	82.4	17.6			17.6
Not Disabled	63	38.1	47.6	12.7	1.6	61.9
Migrant						
Non migrant	80	47.5	41.3	10	1.3	52.5
Limited Eng Prof	1					
Non LEP	79	46.8	41.8	10.1	1.3	53.2
Subsidized Meals	75	49.3	41.3	9.3		50.7
Full Pay Meals	5					

Grade 4

REC038957

DEF_3320-0013

TEX_021023

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	80	58.8	35	5	1.3	41.3	All Students	83	57.8	34.9	7.2	44.2	
Male	44	63.6	31.8	4.5		36.4	Male	46	58.7	34.8	6.5	41.3	
Female	34	52.9	38.2	5.9	2.9	47.1	Female	35	54.3	37.1	8.6	45.7	
White	7						White	9					
African American	71	59.2	35.2	4.2	1.4	40.8	African American	72	58.3	36.1	5.6	41.7	
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	4						Disabled	6					
Not Disabled	76	57.9	35.5	5.3	1.3	42.1	Not Disabled	77	55.8	37.7	6.5	44.2	
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	80	58.8	35	5	1.3	41.3	Non migrant	83	57.8	34.9	7.2	47.2	
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	80	58.8	35	5	1.3	41.3	Non LEP	83	57.8	34.9	7.2	42.2	
Subsidized Meals	66	60.6	34.8	3	1.5	39.4	Subsidized Meals	69	56.5	36.2	7.2	43.5	
Full Pay Meals	14	50	35.7	14.3		50	Full Pay Meals	14	64.3	28.6	7.1	35.7	
Science							Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	85	80	17.6	2.4		20	All Students	85	69.4	27.1	3.5	30.6	
Male	49	81.6	18.4			18.4	Male	49	67.3	30.6	2	32.7	
Female	34	79.4	14.7	5.9		20.6	Female	34	70.6	23.5	5.9	29.4	
White	10	80	20			20	White	10	60	20	20	40	
African American	73	80.8	16.4	2.7		19.2	African American	73	69.9	28.8	1.4	30.1	
Asian/Pacific							Asian/Pacific						

DEF_3320-0014

REC038958

TEX_021024

Is Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan					Is Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	10	90	10	10	Disabled	10	70	20	10	30	
Not Disabled	75	78.7	18.7	2.7	21.3	Not Disabled	75	69.3	28	2.7	30.7
Migrant						Migrant					
Non migrant	85	80	17.6	2.4	20	Non migrant	85	69.4	27.1	3.5	30.6
Limited Eng Prof						Limited Eng Prof					
Non LEP	85	80	17.6	2.4	20	Non LEP	85	69.4	27.1	3.5	30.6
Subsidized Meals	71	80.3	6.9	2.8	19.7	Subsidized Meals	71	69	28.2	2.8	31
Full Pay Meals	14	78.6	21.4		21.4	Full Pay Meals	14	71.4	21.4	7.1	28.6

Grade 5

	English/Language Arts					Mathematics							
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard	
All Students	81	29.6	59.3	11.1		70.4	All Students	82	40.2	46.3	7.3	6.1	59.8
Male	41	39	51.2	9.8		61	Male	42	38.1	42.9	9.5	9.5	61.9
Female	38	18.4	68.4	13.2		81.6	Female	38	42.1	50	5.3	2.6	57.9
White	11	18.2	72.7	9.1		81.8	White	11	27.3	54.5	9.1	9.1	72.7
African American	67	31.3	58.2	10.4		68.7	African American	68	42.6	45.6	7.4	4.4	57.4
Asian/Pacific Is	1						Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan							Hispanic Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	3						Disabled	4					
Not Disabled	78	29.5	59	11.5		70.5	Not Disabled	78	39.7	46.2	7.7	6.4	60.3
Migrant							Migrant						

REC038959

DEF_3320-0015

TEX_021025

Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	81	29.6	59.3	11.1		70.4	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	82	40.2	46.3	7.3	6.1	59.8
Non LEP	81	29.6	59.3	11.1		70.4	Non LEP	82	40.2	46.3	7.3	6.1	59.8
Subsidized Meals	71	28.2	62	9.9		71.8	Subsidized Meals	72	40.3	47.2	6.9	5.6	59.7
Full Pay Meals	10	40	40	20		60	Full Pay Meals	10	40	40	10	10	60

	Number Tested	Science				% Meet Standard
		% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	
All Students	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4
Male	47	72.3	19.1	6.4	2.1	27.7
Female	45	82.2	15.6	2.2		17.8
White	12	58.3	16.7	2.5		41.7
African American	79	81	17.7		1.3	19
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	16	93.8	6.3			6.3
Not Disabled	78	73.1	20.5	5.1	1.3	26.9
Migrant						
Non migrant	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	94	76.6	18.1	4.3	1.1	23.4
Subsidized Meals	83	78.3	16.9	4.8		21.7
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	27.3		9.1	36.4

	Number Tested	Social Studies				% Meet Standard
		% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	
All Students	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Male	48	50	43.8	4.2	2.1	50
Female	45	71.1	24.4	4.4		28.9
White	12	33.3	58.3	8.3		66.7
African American	80	65	31.3	2.5	1.3	35
Asian/Pacific Is	1					
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	17	58.8	41.2			41.2
Not Disabled	78	61.5	32.1	5.1	1.3	38.5
Migrant						
Non migrant	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	95	61.1	33.7	4.2	1.1	38.9
Subsidized Meals	84	60.7	34.5	4.8		39.3
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	27.3		9.1	36.4

If no data is shown above there could be several reasons

1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade

REC038960

DEF_3320-0016

TEX_021026

- 2 There were not enough students who took PACT tests at this school in a given grade or subject to display any statistical information about those students
- 3 There was no data given about this school

[Back to 2004 PACT Report](#)

Legal Info ©2001-2004 South Carolina State Department of Education
 All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders

| [Web Site Tutorial](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Link To Us](#) | [MySchoo.com](#) | [Other Links](#) | [SDE Web Archive](#) | [SDE Web Help](#) | [WebApp Login](#) |
 This page generated on Wed September 08 2004 at 10:57:00AM from server web02



This page
is Bobby Approved

REC038961

DEF_3320-0017

TEX_021027

my schools.com | SIGN UP | LOGIN | YOUR ACCOUNT |
 | SDE WEBSITES | HELP | SCRAPI |

South Carolina Department of Education

DISTRICTS & SCHOOLS EDUCATORS STUDENTS PARENTS SDE OFFICES LEGISLATIVE
 HOME PAGE FINANCE TEST SCORES REPORTS DOWNLOADS STATE BOARD

Bookmark This Page Search This Site

2004 PACT Test Scores - By School

[return to main PACT Report page]
[return to main Florence 4 PACT Report page]

Johnson Middle - Florence 4

Page Generated
10/5/04
Wed September 08 2004

Located on this page is the PACT score data for Johnson Middle

Scores by Demographic

Grade 3

English/Language Arts

Number Tested	%				% Meet Standard
	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	

- All Students
- Male
- Female
- White
- African American
- Asian/Pacific Is
- Hispanic
- Am Indian/Alaskan
- Disabled
- Not Disabled

Mathematics

Number Tested	%				% Meet Standard
	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	

- All Students
- Male
- Female
- White
- African American
- Asian/Pacific Is
- Hispanic
- Am Indian/Alaskan
- Disabled
- Not Disabled

REC038962

DEF_3320-0018

TEX_021028

Florence 4

Migrant
 Non migrant
 Limited Eng
 Prof
 Non LEP
 Subsidized
 Meals
 Full Pay Meals

Migrant
 Non migrant
 Limited Eng
 Prof
 Non LEP
 Subsidized
 Meals
 Full Pay Meals

Science

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	1					
Male						
Female	1					
White						
African American	1					
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	1					
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant	1					
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	1					
Subsidized Meals	1					
Full Pay Meals						

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students						
Male						
Female						
White						
African American						
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled						
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant						
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP						
Subsidized Meals						
Full Pay Meals						

Grade 4

REC038963

DEF_3320-0019

TEX_021029

English/Language Arts

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students						
Male						
Female						
White						
African American						
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic Am						
Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled						
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant						
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP						
Subsidized Meals						
Full Pay Meals						

Science

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	1					
Male	1					
Female						
White						
African American	1					
Asian/Pacific						

Mathematics

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	1					
Male	1					
Female						
White						
African American	1					
Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic						
Am						
Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	1					
Not Disabled						
Migrant						
Non migrant	1					
Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	1					
Subsidized Meals	1					
Full Pay Meals						

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students						
Male						
Female						
White						
African American						
Asian/Pacific						

REC038964

DEF_3320-0020

TEX_021030

Florence 4

Is		Is
Hispanic		Hispanic
Am		Am
Indian/Alaskan		Indian/Alaskan
Disabled	1	Disabled
Not Disabled		Not Disabled
Migrant		Migrant
Non migrant	1	Non migrant
Limited Eng, Prof		Limited Eng Prof
Non LEP	1	Non LEP
Subsidized Meals	1	Subsidized Meals
Full Pay Meals		Full Pay Meals

Grade 6

English/Language Arts						Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard
All Students	65	43.1	41.5	15.4	56.9	All Students	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	85.1
Male	27	48.1	44.4	7.4	51.9	Male	29	24.1	41.4	20.7	75.9
Female	38	39.5	39.5	21.1	60.5	Female	38	7.9	55.3	28.9	92.1
White	14	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	White	15	20	40	26.7	80
African American	51	43.1	41.2	15.7	56.9	African American	52	13.5	51.9	25	86.5
Asian/Pacific Is						Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic						Hispanic					
Am Indian/Alaskan						Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	6					Disabled	7				
Not Disabled	59	42.4	40.7	16.9	57.6	Not Disabled	60	11.7	50	28.3	89.3
Migrant						Migrant					

REC038965

DEF_3320-0021

TEX_021031

Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	65	43.1	41.5	15.4	56.9	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
Non LEP Subsidized Meals	65	43.1	41.5	15.4	56.9	Non LEP Subsidized Meals	67	14.9	49.3	25.4	10.4	85.1
Full Pay Meals	51	47.1	39.2	13.7	52.9	Full Pay Meals	53	17	49.1	24.5	9.4	83
	14	28.6	50	21.4	71.4		14	7.1	50	28.6	14.3	92.9

Science

Social Studies

	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	73	61.6	32.9		5.5	38.4	All Students	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Male	32	68.8	21.9		9.4	31.3	Male	33	63.6	24.2	9.1	3	36.4
Female	41	56.1	41.5		2.4	43.9	Female	41	68.3	29.3	2.4		31.7
White	16	62.5	18.8		18.8	37.5	White	16	56.3	18.8	18.8	6.3	43.8
African American	57	61.4	36.8		1.8	38.6	African American	58	69	29.3	1.7		31
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	12	91.7	8.3			8.3	Disabled	13	76.9	23.1			23.1
Not Disabled	61	55.7	37.7		6.6	44.3	Not Disabled	61	63.9	27.9	6.6	1.6	36.1
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	73	61.6	32.9		5.5	38.4	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Non LEP Subsidized Meals	73	61.6	32.9		5.5	38.4	Non LEP Subsidized Meals	74	66.2	27	5.4	1.4	33.8
Full Pay Meals	58	65.5	29.3		5.2	34.5	Full Pay Meals	59	71.2	22	5.1	1.7	28.8
	15	46.7	46.7		6.7	53.3		15	46.7	46.7	6.7		53.3

Grade 7

REC038966

DEF_3320-0022

TEX_021032

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	70	4.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	All Students	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Male	33	63.6	30.3	6.1		36.4	Male	33	60.6	33.3	3	3	39.4
Female	37	21.6	51.4	27		78.4	Female	37	37.8	35.1	24.3	2.7	62.2
White	0						White	6					
African American	64	42.2	40.6	17.2		57.8	African American	64	46.9	35.9	14.1	3.1	53.1
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic							Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	3						Disabled	3					
Not Disabled	67	38.8	43.3	17.9		61.2	Not Disabled	67	49.3	32.8	14.9	3	50.7
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	Non migrant	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	70	41.4	41.4	17.1		58.6	Non LEP	70	48.6	34.3	14.3	2.9	51.4
Subsidized Meals	53	43.4	41.5	15.1		56.6	Subsidized Meals	53	50.9	37.7	11.3		49.1
Full Pay Meals	17	35.3	41.2	23.5		64.7	Full Pay Meals	17	41.2	23.5	23.5	11.8	58.8
Science							Social Studies						
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	All Students	70	71.4	28.6			28.6
Male	34	73.5	17.6	5.9	2.9	26.5	Male	33	75.8	24.2			24.2
Female	37	48.6	35.1	5.4	10.8	51.4	Female	37	67.6	32.4			32.4
White	6						White	6					
African American	65	61.5	26.2	4.6	7.7	38.5	African American	64	71.9	28.1			28.1
Asian/Pacific							Asian/Pacific						

REC038967

DEF_3320-0023

TEX_021033

Is Hispanic							Is Hispanic						
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Category	Count	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	% Meet Standard	Category	Count	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	% Meet Standard
Disabled	4						Disabled	3					
Not Disabled	67	58.2	28.4	6	7.5	41.8	Not Disabled	67	70.1	29.9			29.9
Migrant							Migrant						
Non migrant	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	Non migrant	70	71.4	28.6			28.6
Limited Eng Prof							Limited Eng Prof						
Non LEP	71	60.6	26.8	5.6	7	39.4	Non LEP	70	71.4	28.6			28.6
Subsidized Meals	54	68.5	24.1	5.6	1.9	31.5	Subsidized Meals	53	79.2	20.8			20.8
Full Pay Meals	17	35.3	35.3	5.9	23.5	64.7	Full Pay Meals	17	47.1	52.9			52.9

Grade 8

	English/Language Arts							Mathematics					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Meet Standard
All Students	74	48.6	50	1.4		51.4	All Students	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	1.4	45.9
Male	37	51.4	48.6			48.6	Male	37	45.9	51.4	2.7		54.1
Female	37	45.9	51.4	2.7		54.1	Female	37	62.2	35.1		2.7	37.8
White	9						White	9					
African American	64	53.1	46.9			46.9	African American	64	59.4	39.1	1.6		40.6
Asian/Pacific Is							Asian/Pacific Is						
Hispanic	1						Hispanic	1					
Am Indian/Alaskan							Am Indian/Alaskan						
Disabled	4						Disabled	4					
Not Disabled	70	50	48.6	1.4		50	Not Disabled	70	52.9	44.3	1.4	1.4	47.1
Migrant							Migrant						

REC038968

DEF_3320-0024

TEX_021034

Science						Social Studies					
	Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard		Number Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Meet Standard
Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	74	48.6	50	1.4	51.4	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	45.9
Non LEP	74	48.6	50	1.4	51.4	Non LEP	74	54.1	43.2	1.4	45.9
Subsidized Meals	63	46	52.4	1.6	54	Subsidized Meals	63	52.4	44.4	1.6	47.6
Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	36.4		36.4	Full Pay Meals	11	63.6	36.4		36.4
All Students	78	78.2	20.5	1.3	21.8	All Students	78	73.1	23.1	3.8	26.9
Male	40	72.5	27.5		27.5	Male	40	80	15	5	20
Female	38	84.2	13.2	2.6	15.8	Female	38	65.8	31.6	2.6	34.2
White	10	50	50		50	White	10	50	30	20	50
African American	67	83.6	16.4		16.4	African American	67	77.6	20.9	1.5	22.4
Asian/Pacific Is						Asian/Pacific Is					
Hispanic	1					Hispanic	1				
Am Indian/Alaskan						Am Indian/Alaskan					
Disabled	9					Disabled	9				
Not Disabled	69	78.3	20.3	1.4	21.7	Not Disabled	69	72.5	24.6	2.9	27.5
Migrant						Migrant					
Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	78	78.2	20.5	1.3	21.8	Non migrant Limited Eng Prof	78	73.1	23.1	3.8	26.9
Non LEP	78	78.2	20.5	1.3	21.8	Non LEP	78	73.1	23.1	3.8	26.9
Subsidized Meals	66	81.8	16.7	1.5	18.2	Subsidized Meals	66	74.2	22.7	3	25.8
Full Pay Meals	12	58.3	41.7		41.7	Full Pay Meals	12	66.7	25	8.3	33.3

[no data is shown above there could be several reasons

1 There were no students who took PACT tests at this school in any subjects for a given grade

REC038969

DEF_3320-0025

TEX_021035