

DRAFT-JULY 2007 UPDATE
INTERIM EVALUATION ON
THE FIRST YEAR
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CHILD DEVELOPMENT
EDUCATION PILOT
PROGRAM (CDEPP)

An update to the February 2007 report from the
Education Oversight Committee Pursuant to
Proviso 1.75 of the 2006-07 General Appropriation
Act



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

PO Box 11867 | 227 Blatt Building | Columbia SC 29211 | WWW.SCEOC.ORG

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
I. Background Information	1
II. Allocations, Expenditures and Analyses of Student, Teacher and Provider Data	5
III. Update of Issues Identified from Interim Evaluation of CDEPP Start-Up	23
IV. Evaluation Activities for FY 2007-2008.....	25
Appendices:	
A. Provisos 1.66 and 1.79 of the 2007-08 General Appropriation Act	A-1
B. Allocations to CDEPP Districts.....	B-1
C. Allocations to Private Providers.....	C-1
D. Number of Students Served by District	D-1

DRAFT
Executive Summary
Update to the February 2007 Interim Evaluation of the First Year Implementation of the
Child Development Education Program (CDEPP)

This report updates the February 2007 “Interim Evaluation Report on the First Year Implementation of the Child Development Pilot Program (CDEPP)” based on fiscal and student program participation data collected by the State Department of Education (SDE) and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness (OFS) in March and April 2007. The Department of Social Services (DSS) and the State Head Start Collaboration Office also provided updated student data collected in May 2007. The purposes of this update to the interim report are to report progress made in the improvement of program data quality, provide more accurate information from the pilot’s start-up year, identify additional issues revealed by the pilot for consideration should the program be permanently enacted, and to describe planned evaluation activities over the next several months in preparation for the January 2008 report to the General Assembly on the pilot program.

Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Appropriations, Allocations, and Expenditures

The following information is based upon financial data provided to the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) by the SDE and by OFS. The data do not reflect the final, official expenditures which will be verified with the Comptroller General’s Office when the state’s Fiscal Year 2006-07 budget is complete. In summary, Table 5 (below) from the full report highlights the financial expenditures and provision of services for CDEPP in 2006-07 based on the most recent data.

Table 5
CDEPP
Based on Financial Data ALONE

	Department of Education	Office of First Steps
2006-07 Supplemental Appropriations	\$15,717,104.00	\$ 7,858,576.00
Children Funded	2,932	309
New Classrooms Funded	164	39
Average No. CDEPP Children per Funded Classroom	17.9	7.9
Program Expenditures:		
Instructional	\$9,021,764.00	\$ 817,007.00
Transportation	\$ 245,865.00	\$ 14,269.00
Supplies & Materials	\$1,607,999.44	\$ 372,600.00
Training	\$160,574.65	¹
TOTAL:	\$11,036,203.09	\$1,203,876.00
Administration		
State	\$96,307.53	\$ 288,363.00
County Partnerships		\$28,967.00
Grants to SCAEYC and SCECA	\$58,485.75	
Estimated Balance:	\$4,526,107.63	\$6,134,406.00

¹ Training is not a separate line item. Training provided to teachers in private settings is part of the agency’s administrative costs included in contractual services and travel.

Conclusions:

- Based upon financial data provided to the EOC by the Department of Education on July 19, 2007 and by the Office of First Steps to School Readiness on June 30, 2007, the state paid for 3,241 children to participate in CDEPP – 2,932 in public schools and 309 in private settings.
- Of the \$23,575,680 that was allocated for the first year of the CDEPP pilot program, approximately \$12,915,166.37 or 55% was expended leaving a carry forward of approximately \$10,660,513.63. The budget surplus is due to at least three factors: (1) non-participation in CDEPP by eight eligible school districts; (2) normal lag time in implementing a new program and in approving eligible private providers; and (3) difficulty in finding and enrolling eligible children in both public and private programs.
- During the first year of the pilot program the financial systems established to reimburse public and private providers were significantly different. The Department of Education used a cumulative enrollment count that did not take into account the child's attendance or membership. On the other hand, private providers were reimbursed based on actual invoices received using a pro-rated student attendance count. The Department of Education will incorporate a daily rate in the second year of the pilot program.
- And, unlike the Department of Education which reimbursed public schools directly through allocations to school districts, private providers received reimbursements directly from the county First Steps partnerships that, in turn, had been allocated funds from the state Office of First Steps. The Office of First Steps did monitor the reimbursement system and collect information on all invoices processed.

Analysis of Student, Teacher, and Provider Data

The public school student and teacher data used for this update are based on the data collections by the SDE at approximately three-fourths of the way through the 180-day school year (known as the "135th-day data collection," it takes place in late March or early April). The private CDEPP provider data were provided by the OFS and are based on data through April 2007. Data from four year old students served 30 hours or more per week in an ABC Voucher child care program were provided by the Department of Social Services (DSS), and data from four year old students enrolled in Head Start programs were provided by the State Head Start Collaboration Office. The DSS and Head Start data are based on May 2007 enrollments. In general, the completeness and accuracy of the 135th-day data regarding CDEPP is quite encouraging compared to the data available for the February interim report.

Twenty-nine of the 37 plaintiff districts participated in CDEPP in 2006-2007 and 8 did not. All 8 of the trial districts participated in CDEPP. Among the 29 participating districts, six elected to institute CDEPP in some, but not all, of their schools housing four-year-old child development programs. (See Table 7 in the full report.)

Eligible four-year-olds residing in the plaintiff districts could attend a CDEPP program provided either by eligible private providers or by the local public school system. There were 36 private providers serving at least one CDEPP-eligible student (listed in Table 8 in report). Thirty-four of these private providers were located in plaintiff school districts and 2 were located in non-plaintiff districts. Eligible students could attend a CDEPP program in a private provider located in a non-plaintiff district, but the student was required to live in a plaintiff district.

Numbers of students served

Data listed in Appendix D Tables 1-3 in the report are summarized and comparative information from the 2005-2006 school year are provided in Table 9 (below) in the report.

Table 9
Summary of Numbers of Students Participating in State-Funded Four-Year-Old Pre-Kindergarten Programs, 2005-06 and 2006-07 School Years
135th-day Data Collection (March-April 2007)

PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT GROUP	ALL 85 DISTRICTS		37 PLAINTIFF DISTRICTS		29 DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN CDEPP**	
	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06
Four-year-old Population Estimate	57,251	56,114	11,642	11,746	9,615	9,731
Children in Poverty* Estimate	36,794	35,010	9,116	9,092	7,515	7,524
Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Estimate	30,495	29,737	7,926	8,016	6,546	6,639
Public School 4K Total Served	20,569	21,145	5,072	5,095	4,311	4,265
Public Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Served Total	13,362	12,871	3,758	3,476	3,254	2,934
Public School Pay Lunch Served	7,199	8,142	1,281	1,564	1,051	1,301
Public School Lunch Status Missing	8	132	6	55	6	30
Public School CDEPP** Served (Student Data File)	2,717	N/A	2,717	N/A	2,717	N/A
Public School CDEPP** Served (Finance Data File)	2,932	N/A	2,932	N/A	2,932	N/A
First Steps CDEPP** Students Served (2006-07 only)	303	N/A	302	N/A	236	N/A
First Steps Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Served (2005-06 only)	N/A	123	N/A	0	N/A	0
Full-Day ABC Voucher Served Estimated	3,471	2,495	738	446	631	391
Head Start Served Estimated	5,806	6,057	1,972	2,008	1,434	1,516
Public School Free/Reduced, 1 st Steps, ABC, Head Start Total	23,559	21,546	6,881	5,930	5,630	4,841
Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Students NOT Served	6,936	8,191	1,045	2,086	916	1,798

* Children in Poverty include children eligible for the Federal free- or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid services; these students meet the eligibility requirements for participation in the CDEPP program.

**CDEPP = Child Development Education Pilot Program

N/A= Not Applicable.

Data Sources: Student data files and Finance files, S.C. Department of Education; Census population estimates (2006), Office of Research & Statistics, S.C. Budget and Control Board; Birth population estimates (2005), S.C. Department of Health & Environmental Control; S.C. Office of First Steps to School Readiness; S.C. Department of Social Services (ABC Voucher data); and the S.C. Head Start Collaboration Office

How many four-year-olds participated in CDEPP in April 2007?

The number of eligible four-year-olds participating in CDEPP at the time of the 135th-day data collection in the 29 participating school districts was 2,717. The number of four-year-olds participating in First Steps private provider CDEPP programs was 303 (based on student enrollment data provided on May 2, 2007). There were a total of 3,020 students (2,717 in public schools, 303 in private centers) enrolled in CDEPP at the time of the 135th-day data collection. Based on the finance data, a cumulative total of 3,241 students (2,932 in public schools, 309 in private centers) participated at some time during the 2006-2007 school year by the 135th day of instruction.

Were more eligible students served with publicly-funded public and private full-day pre-kindergarten programs in the 37 plaintiff districts and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP in 2006-07 than in 2005-06?

Yes, more students living in the plaintiff districts eligible for the Federal lunch program were served in a publicly-funded pre-kindergarten program in 2006-07: 951 (from 5,930 in 2005-2006 to 6,881 in 2006-2007) more students were served in the 37 plaintiff districts, and 789 (from 4,841 to 5,630) more students were served in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP. The state-level data also showed an increase of 2,013 total students eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program served statewide in a publicly-funded pre-kindergarten program (from 21,546 in 2005-06 to 23,559 in 2006-07).

What are the demographic characteristics of CDEPP-participating students?

Almost two-thirds (66.2%) of public school CDEPP students are African American, compared to almost 90% of students receiving CDEPP services from private providers. More than one-third of public school CDEPP students are White, compared to only 5% of CDEPP students in private centers. The percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in CDEPP provided in public schools is also higher than the percentage of CDEPP students in private centers.

In 2006-2007, 3.5% of the four year old students attending CDEPP in public schools were eligible for LEP services (none of the CDEPP students in programs provided by private providers were indicated as eligible for LEP services), but the data provided do not indicate how many actually were provided such services.

Accurate and comprehensive information on CDEPP students' disabilities and the disability-related educational services they received was not available from the public school data for this update. Four of the CDEPP students participating in CDEPP provided by private providers were indicated as having Individualized Education Plans (IEP) related to their disabilities. It seems that CDEPP would have an important role in the identification and provision of educational services to young children having disabilities to help in the prevention of future academic problems for these students. This issue and the numbers of four year old children having disabilities and the services provided for them will be studied further for reporting in the January 1, 2008 report to the General Assembly.

What is the average class size of CDEPP classrooms?

At the time of the 135th-day data collection the average public school CDEPP classroom contained 17.9 students, ranging from 6 to 21 students. The average number of CDEPP-eligible students in these classrooms was 15.8, with a range of 2 to 20 students. The average number of students in these classrooms who were not eligible for CDEPP was 2.1, with a range from 0 ineligible students to 10. These data indicate that there is a moderate level of economic diversity among students enrolled in public school classrooms containing CDEPP-eligible students. There is some evidence from the evaluations of the Georgia preschool programs and from other studies that heterogeneous classroom settings provide educational benefits to academically at-risk students. The average private center enrolled 8.4 CDEPP students, with a range from a minimum of 1 student to a maximum of 20 students per center (classroom data were not available).

Issues Identified in the Update to the February 2007 Interim Evaluation Report

The February 2007 interim CDEPP evaluation report raised several issues revealed by the data collected from the early start-up activities for the first year of the pilot. Those issues included:

- Concerns about the poor quality of program and student data;
- Need for marketing the program to parents and providers to expand participation in the program, revealed by the projected funding surplus for the program;
- Per-child and transportation reimbursement levels in the first year of the pilot may have been insufficient to make the program sufficiently attractive to some potential providers;
- The program's high teacher requirements and the facilities requirements were identified by some program administrators as barriers to expansion;
- More information from a second year of the pilot was needed to better inform future legislation.

This update to the interim evaluation report confirms the need to focus on those issues and adds some additional issues for consideration:

1. The funding surplus from the first year of the CDEPP pilot emphasizes the need for increased marketing of the CDEP program to parents and potential program providers. Of the \$23,575,680 that was allocated for the first year of the CDEPP pilot program, approximately \$12,915,166.37 or 55% was expended leaving a carry forward of approximately \$10,660,513.63. The budget surplus is due to at least three factors: (1) non-participation in CDEPP by eight eligible school districts; (2) normal lag time in implementing a new program and in approving eligible private providers; and (3) difficulty in finding and enrolling eligible children in both public and private programs. Information on the numbers of providers anticipated in 2007-2008 and projections of the numbers of students to be served are anticipated by the SDE and OFS by late July 2007; this information was not available at the time this report was drafted.
2. The quality and completeness of the 2006-2007 program data improved substantially by the time of the April 2007 data collection. The improvement in quality of the data can be attributed to the efforts on the part of state agency and local provider personnel during the year, and demonstrates that accurate and comprehensive data for early childhood programs can be collected. Some data quality and availability issues remain, however, and the issue needs continued attention. For example, not all students have been assigned the necessary unique student identifier needed for program evaluation and record-keeping. DIAL3 screening assessments were conducted by school and provider personnel, but problems with the collection of those results by the state agencies for evaluation purposes need to be solved. Information on students with disabilities and on Limited English Proficient (LEP) students is currently either not available or incomplete.
3. While the data are incomplete, it is clear that some of the students enrolled in CDEPP also have disabilities and/or are not native speakers of English (LEP students). Students with disabilities may also be eligible for CDEPP if their families meet the income or Medicaid requirements. The level of participation in CDEPP of students having disabilities is not clear from the available data nor is information on the kinds of educational services CDEPP participants with disabilities are receiving. The role of full-

day pre-kindergarten programs in the education of preschool children with disabilities should be examined in the planning of future state-funded preschool programs.

In 2006-2007, 3.5% of the four year old students attending CDEPP in public schools were eligible for LEP services, but the data provided do not indicate how many actually were provided such services. Demographic projections indicate that the numbers of children in South Carolina who have a language other than English as their primary language will increase substantially over the next several years. The need for educational programs to help these students acquire English language skills sufficient to meet the academic challenges of the State's standards-based educational system should be a consideration in the future implementation of state-funded preschool programs.

More in-depth review of the issues of providing language and special educational services to CDEPP students will be conducted for the January 1, 2008 evaluation report to the General Assembly.

Section I: Background Information

On March 15, 2006 the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) transmitted to the General Assembly a report entitled, "Results and Related Recommendations of the Inventory and Study of Four-Year-Old Kindergarten Programs in South Carolina" (available at www.eoc.sc.gov). The report, prepared at the request of the legislature pursuant to the provisions of Concurrent Resolution 4484 of 2006, included the following: (1) an inventory and study of all four-year-old kindergarten programs in the State including an analysis of the funding of each program and any effectiveness measures; (2) a determination of the necessary requirements to implement a full day four-year-old kindergarten program in each of the eight plaintiff school districts in the case of Abbeville County School District, et al., v. State of South Carolina, et al.; and (3) a determination of the necessary requirements to implement a statewide, full day four-year-old kindergarten program for all children who qualify for free- or reduced-price lunches. Working with the Budget and Control Board, the Department of Education, the Department of Social Services, First Steps, Head Start, school districts and policy researchers at the Andrew Young Center for Public Policy of Georgia State University, faculty at the University of South Carolina, and the Southern Regional Education Board, the EOC completed the report which included the following recommendations:

1. The State of South Carolina should provide well-targeted and high-quality, center-based early childhood education services in public and private settings for all four-year-old children who are at-risk for school failure, particularly children who are eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program.
2. The high-quality, center-based program should incorporate the following:
 - a state-approved, research-based curriculum aligned with school success
 - a 6.5 hour program encompassing education, physical activity, nutrition and health and developmental screenings with linkages to services as necessary
 - a lead teacher with a four-year degree in early childhood education or a closely related area (e.g., child development, family studies, early childhood special education) and an aide to provide an adult-child ratio of 1:10 in a class of not less than 16 children nor more than 20 children.
3. A single state agency should administer the program to include the following:
 - Establishment and implementation of regulations enforcing program quality
 - Identification, development, and monitoring of eligible providers to ensure the quality of opportunity
 - Provision of technical assistance to all participating personnel (teachers, aides and principals/directors) providing the program for four-year-olds
 - Administration of a grants program for resource coordinators to accomplish linkages to health and social services for the child
 - Participation in an external evaluation program
 - Collaboration with the South Carolina Head Start Collaboration Office to develop strategic partnerships between Head Start programs and the public and private providers who will serve these four-year-olds at risk of school failure to create a seamless system of early childhood education
4. The State should link funding directly to children who receive the early childhood education services and provide funding only when
 - The provider initially meets and continues to meet all state program and facilities standards

- The provider participates in an on-going process of technical assistance, monitoring, assessment and evaluation of services and child outcomes
 - The provider maintains sufficient enrollment of the targeted students (i.e., a class of not less than 16 students nor more than 20 students)
5. The child should be provided, as indicated, an array of well-targeted, high-quality wraparound services. Efficient and effective use of multiple federal, state and private funding should be undertaken when providing high quality services for four-year-old children and their families.
 6. The role of the family should be supported and nurtured during the child's early childhood experiences. Specifically, the parent should have access to the following:
 - Sufficient and understandable information to determine which provider to use for his/her child
 - Continuing information on the child's progress and the impact of the program on the child's readiness for school success
 7. A state-level interagency data system for children and families served with any public funds should be established and maintained to monitor service provision, quality and impact for four-year-old children who are at risk for school failure. The database should include selected process measures for early childhood education and wrap-around services received (e.g., number of children served, curriculum used, assessments employed, length of school day, type of parent education program, nature of service coordination).
 8. The state should establish and maintain a well-planned collaborative evaluation across five years (i.e., one year of planning and preparing and four years of data collection) which is independent of the providers and regulating agency and which evaluates both process and child outcome measures of state-funded services for four-year-old children who are at risk of school failure.

While the General Assembly did not enact permanent legislation expanding early childhood education programs in the 2006 legislative session, it did include a Proviso, Proviso 1.75, in the 2006-07 General Appropriation Act. Proviso 1.75 created the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program (CDEPP). The key components of the program are:

- Establishment of a two-year pilot program providing high-quality, full-day (6.5 hours per day) for 180 days per year in both public and private settings for four-year-olds eligible for free or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid and living in the eight trial districts in Abbeville County School District et al. vs. South Carolina: Allendale, Dillon 2, Florence 4, Hampton 2, Jasper, Lee, Marion 7, and Orangeburg 3;
- Funding of the program at \$23,575,680 in non-recurring general funds and Capital Reserve Fund appropriations to reimburse providers at \$3,077 per child for instructional costs, \$185 per child for transportation and \$10,000 per new classroom for equipment and supplies;
- Expansion of the program to include all eligible children in the plaintiff school districts in Abbeville County School District et al. vs. South Carolina if sufficient funds are available;

- Designation of the Department of Education as the agency responsible for selecting qualified public school providers to participate in CDEPP and for implementing the program;
- Designation of the Office of First Steps as the entity responsible for selecting qualified non-public school providers to participate in CDEPP and for implementing the program;
- Requirement that the Education Oversight Committee complete a comparative evaluation of the pilot program by January 1, 2008 to include recommendations “for the creation of and an implementation plan for phasing in the delivery of services to all four-year-old at-risk children in the state.”

In February 2007 the EOC published the “Interim Evaluation Report on the First Year Implementation of the Child Development Pilot Program” (available at www.eoc.sc.gov) which described the early implementation of the first year of the pilot program established by Proviso 1.75. That report, based on mid-year data fiscal and student data, identified several issues regarding data quality, funding, marketing of the program, and facility needs:

1. The quality of the administrative and student data in CDEPP must be improved. The incomplete or inaccurate identification of CDEPP students by some participating districts resulted in inconsistency between the number of students actually identified as being served and the number of students on whom funding disbursements are currently being made. Other data quality issues which need to be addressed include the compelling need to assign unique student identifying numbers (“SUNS”) to all participating students, public and private. All students must have the unique identifying numbers both for the longitudinal evaluation and for long-term record-keeping on the part of school districts and the Office of First Steps. There is also a need to provide more specific information on the programs individual students attend, especially the duration of the program (half- or full-day) and the identity of the “lead teacher” in the classroom.
2. More attention should be placed by state agencies on marketing CDEPP to parents and to potential program providers. The modest increase in the numbers of students served by four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs in the CDEPP-participating districts and the projected surplus in the program this fiscal year reflects the need to recruit systematically more families and providers if more at-risk students are to be served.
3. The costs associated with providing a high-quality program for at-risk four-year-old students must be further examined to determine the levels of funding needed. The findings from the evaluation of the start-up period of CDEPP indicate that higher levels of funding will be needed to support a high-quality program and to provide student transportation.
4. During the CDEPP start-up period administrators’ concerns about the specific requirements for Department of Social Services licensure and the costs encountered in meeting those requirements were a recurring theme as indicated by the survey and interview results. The licensing process, including the roles of state fire, safety, and health regulations and the difficulties public school districts report meeting the licensing regulations is an area which will receive additional study by the evaluators.
5. Higher requirements in CDEPP for teacher and teaching assistant qualifications were cited by some public school providers as posing a barrier for expansion of CDEPP.

6. The findings from the initial evaluation of the start-up year for CDEPP support continuation of the pilot for an additional year to better inform future legislation. We need more information on how school districts and private providers can meet the space and personnel needs resulting from expansion of the program, on what levels of funding are appropriate, on what teacher qualifications are needed, on how to ensure that the “dollars follow the child,” and on how school districts and private providers can meet the needs of the clientele they are currently serving along with additional at-risk students, as well as what incentives for program expansion are needed.

In the 2007 legislative session the General Assembly continued the second year of the pilot by enacting Provisos 1.66 and 1.79 of the 2007-2008 General Appropriations Act (Appendix A). Proviso 1.66 addresses several of the issues identified in the EOC interim evaluation report and continues the pilot program for eligible students in the trial and plaintiff districts.

This report updates the February 2007 “Interim Evaluation Report on the First Year Implementation of the Child Development Pilot Program” based on fiscal and student program participation data collected by the State Department of Education (SDE) and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness (OFS) in March and April 2007. The Department of Social Services (DSS) and the State Head Start Collaboration Office also provided updated student data collected in May 2007. The purposes of this update to the interim report are to report progress made in the improvement of program data quality, provide more accurate information from the pilot’s start-up year, identify additional issues revealed by the pilot for consideration should the program be permanently enacted, and to describe planned evaluation activities over the next several months in preparation for the January 2008 report to the General Assembly on the pilot program.

Section II. Allocations, Expenditures, and Analyses of Student, Teacher, and Provider Data

This section of the report is an analysis of the financial, student, teacher and provider data available on CDEPP. Depending upon the data source used, the results of the analyses may reveal inconsistencies between student and financial data. The goal is to update the interim evaluation of the pilot program as defined in Proviso 1.75 using the most recent data available.

Fiscal Year 2006-07 Appropriations, Allocations and Expenditures

Paragraph K of Proviso 1.75. of the 2006-07 General Appropriation Act established the reimbursements for eligible children served in the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program (CDEPP).

- (K) The General Assembly shall provide funding for the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program. For the 2006-07 school year, the funded cost per child shall be \$3,077. Additionally, a reimbursement rate of \$185 per child will be appropriated to providers if the provider transports children to and from school. Providers who are reimbursed are required to retain records as required by their fiscal agent. For the 2007-2008 school year the funded cost per child shall be the same but shall be increased by the same projected rate of inflation as determined by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Budget and Control Board for the Education Finance Act. With funds appropriated by the General Assembly, the Department of Education shall approve grants for public providers and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall approve grants for private providers, of up to \$10,000 per class for the equipping of new classrooms.

In Fiscal Year 2006-07 the General Assembly appropriated a total of \$23,575,680 in non-recurring funds for CDEPP. With these funds, both public and private providers received \$3,077 per child to cover the cost of instruction, \$185 per child for transportation of children to and from approved providers, and \$10,000 per classroom for supplies and materials to equip each new classroom.

Unless noted otherwise, the following information is based upon financial data provided to the EOC by the Department of Education on July 19, 2007 and by the Office of First Steps to School Readiness on June 30, 2007. While the state fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30, outstanding vouchers and payments are not finalized by the Comptroller General's office until the end of July. Consequently the data provided below do not reflect official and final expenditures. Instead, the January 1, 2008 report on CDEPP will provide conclusive financial information based upon verification of financial records with the Comptroller General's office for 2006-07 expenditures by both the Department of Education and the Office of First Steps.

Public Providers (Department of Education): According to the monthly allocations to school districts for Fiscal Year 2006-07 as reported by the Department of Education on its website, twenty-nine school districts serving children in the Child Development Education Pilot Program (CDEPP) received \$9,021,764 in Fiscal Year 2006-07 for instructional costs.² Based upon a per child reimbursement rate of \$3,077, public schools were reimbursed for serving 2,932 children in CDEPP (Appendix B-1). The 2,932 figure was the enrollment based on the 135-day cumulative enrollment count. The Department reimbursed school districts \$3,077 for each student who was ever enrolled in a CDEPP classroom regardless of the days of membership or attendance.

According to the Department, \$1,607,999.44 was also allocated to school districts for reimbursement for the equipping of new classrooms with supplies and materials. The Department reported allocating \$1,607,999.44 to twenty-nine districts for CDEPP classrooms in seventy schools. Analyzing the allocation of funds by school, it was determined that 164 new CDEPP classrooms in Fiscal Year 2006-07 were funded. The mean per classroom allocation was \$9,805 with a maximum allocation of \$10,000 and a minimum allocation of \$5,395.06 per classroom (Appendix B-2). And, across districts, the average total allocation per district for supplies and materials for new classrooms was \$55,448. Orangeburg 5 received the most funds for supplies and materials at \$156,868.05 while Barnwell 19 received the least at \$10,000.

The following analysis was conducted to determine the average classroom size using financial data only. The analysis is based upon the premise that, with 2006-07 being the first year of CDEPP, all 2,932 students reimbursed were enrolled in one of the 164 classrooms that received the \$10,000 allocation for supplies and materials. Based upon this assumption, the average CDEPP-funded classroom had 17.9 children. The average classroom enrollment across districts ranged from 14.3 to 22.3 children.

The Department of Education also reported that, of the twenty-nine CDEPP districts, twenty-eight reported providing transportation to CDEPP students. Hampton 2 did not seek transportation reimbursements. Of the 2,932 students participating in the program, school districts reported transporting 1,329 or 45% of all CDEPP children in public schools. The total amount reimbursed to these twenty-eight districts was \$245,865 (Appendix B-3). Because the school bus system in South Carolina is operated and managed by the state, these districts, in turn, reimbursed the Department of Education \$245,865 for the provision of services. Initially, the \$185 reimbursement rate for transportation that was recommended by the EOC in its March 2006 report was intended to cover the district share of the cost of the bus transportation system as documented by InSite data.

Regarding professional development training and program meetings, the Department reported allocating \$160,574.65 to school districts. These funds were used by districts to reimburse teachers and district staff for travel expenses related to professional development, training events and conferences. These conferences and training events included Work Sampling training, Creative Curriculum training, High School curriculum training and Dial 3 training. Districts also used these funds to pay for substitute teachers.

Regarding administrative costs at the Department of Education, a total of \$96,307.53 was expended for "purchased services" that included such expenses as the purchase of curriculum

² South Carolina Department of Education, "Monthly Payments to School Districts," June 22, 2007, <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/finance/monthlypayments/JUNE07.txt>.

materials, translation services, education supplies and travel for agency staff. The Department also awarded grants to two professional development organizations totaling \$58,485.75. The South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children (SCAEYC) received \$24,000 and the South Carolina Early Childhood Association (SCECA), \$34,483.75. These grant funds were used to support two conferences on early childhood education which were attended by CDEPP teachers and coordinators. Not included in any of the above administrative costs were the salaries of individuals at the Department of Education who oversee the program implementation and manage the financial reimbursement system for CDEPP. These additional costs of implementing and managing CDEPP will be included in the January 1, 2008 report.

In summary, a preliminary and unverified estimate of expenditures by the Department of Education for the provision of services for children under the CDEPP program in public schools reveals that 61% of the initial appropriation will be expended in Fiscal Year 2006-07. An estimated balance of \$4,526,107.63 will be carried forward and expended for CDEPP according to provisions 1.66. and 1.79. of the 2007-08 General Appropriation Act.

Table 1
2006-07 Estimated Expenditures
Department of Education – CDEPP

2006-07 Supplemental Appropriations	\$15,717,104.00	
Expenditures by Districts:		
Instructional	(\$9,021,764.00)	2,932 Children Funded
Transportation	(\$ 245,865.00)	1,328 Children Funded
Supplies & Materials	(\$1,607,999.44)	164 Classrooms Funded
Training	(\$ 160,574.65)	
Expenditures by Agency:		
Administration	(\$ 96,307.53)	
Grants to SCAEYC and SCECA	(\$ 58,485.75)	
Estimated Balance:	\$4,526,107.63	

Private Providers (Office of First Steps): The Office of First Steps to School Readiness (OFS) implemented a financial system for reimbursing private providers incorporating the existing structure of county First Steps partnerships. OFS enlisted the support of twenty county partnerships to process and issue reimbursements for private providers (Table 2). These county partnerships were selected either because private providers would be operating within the county and serving eligible four-year-olds or because eligible four-year-olds would be attending one or more programs provided in the county. During the course of the fiscal year, OFS disbursed a total of \$1,406,840 to these twenty county partnerships to ensure that the partnerships had sufficient funds available to reimburse private providers on a biweekly basis.

Table 2
First Steps County Partnerships – CDEPP

Abbeville	Barnwell	Clarendon	Hampton	Marion
Aiken	Beaufort	Dillon	Jasper	Orangeburg
Allendale	Berkeley	Florence	Lee	Saluda
Bamberg	Charleston	Georgetown	Lexington	Williamsburg

To help offset a portion of the administrative cost of processing the reimbursements, OFS reimbursed the county partnerships. With funds allocated for the private CDEPP program,

\$28,967 was allocated to the local county partnerships for the processing of the invoices. County partnerships were allocated funds accordingly: \$100 per participating provider; \$250 per county; and \$63 per child enrolled in the program. The State Office of First Steps monitored the reimbursement system and collected information on all invoices processed.

Regarding the actual invoices, OFS reported to the EOC that as of June 30, 2007 forty private providers had received funds to equip classrooms and serve children under the 4K Expansion Program. First, these providers were reimbursed \$817,007 for instructional costs to serve 309 children.³ Unlike the Department of Education, the Office of First Steps reimbursed for actual invoices received. Furthermore, the \$3,077 reimbursement was pro rated based on the actual days that children were enrolled in the private CDEPP classrooms. Similarly, First Steps reported that \$372,597 was expended for supplies and materials to equip approximately 39 classrooms. In these classrooms the enrollment varied from one student to 20 students. Based solely on financial data, dividing the total state enrollment of 309 by the number of new classrooms, 39, the average classroom size was 7.9 children. Finally, private providers were reimbursed \$14,269 for transporting forty-five children (Appendix C).

It should be pointed out that 65% of the providers who received funding served fewer than ten eligible children in a classroom. Other four-year-olds may have been enrolled in the class and receiving educational services; however, for purposes of this report, the emphasis is on eligible children. Space may also be an issue with many of these small private providers, preventing them from serving more eligible children. Consequently, the cost per child per provider” to provide a program ranges from \$1,410 to \$11,196 per provider. The “cost per child per provider” is determined by dividing the total invoices paid to each provider by the total number of eligible children served by the provider. The average is \$3,896 across all private providers (Appendix C). Again, there may be other four-year-olds served in these programs but for purposes of this analysis, the focus is on children eligible for the state services.

Regarding administrative costs, the Office of First Steps reported expenditures of \$288,363 for the following functions related to the implementation of CDEPP.

³ Financial reimbursements were made for 309 eligible children. Three providers received funds to equip classrooms and provide instructional services for five eligible children. However, as of the 135-day of the program, these providers no longer served children, resulting in 304 children officially being served by private providers.

**Table 3
Administrative Expenses-Office of First Steps**

Payroll	\$ 125,407.00
Employer Contribution	\$ 17,467.00
Contractual Services	\$ 75,741.00
Supplies	\$ 34,185.00
Fixed Charges	\$ 1,305.00
Travel	\$ <u>34,258.00</u>
Total:	\$ 288,363.00

The payroll includes the cost of three regional coordinators who traveled and worked with private providers. These coordinators were temporary contract employees. In addition, contractual services and travel costs were associated with training and professional development opportunities provided to teachers in the private settings. Not included in the above administrative costs are the salaries of individuals employed at the Office of First Steps who oversee the program implementation and manage the reimbursement system for 4K Expansion. These additional costs of implementing and managing the program will be included in the January 1, 2008 report.

In summary, a preliminary and unverified estimate of expenditures by the Office of First Steps for the provision of services for children under the 4K Expansion Program reveals that between approximately 22% of the initial appropriation will be expended in Fiscal Year 2006-07. A balance will be carried forward and expended for CDEPP based on provisos 1.66. and 1.79. of the 2007-08 General Appropriation Act. It should be noted that if the Office of First Steps had not used a pro-rated system of reimbursing and instead had reimbursed based on a cumulative count like the Department of Education, private providers would have received \$950,646 in reimbursements for instruction or 23% of the initial appropriation. A cumulative count would have increased the instructional costs of the program from \$817,007 to \$920,646 for a 13% increase.

**Table 4
2006-07 Estimated Expenditures
Office of First Steps –CDEPP**

2006-07 Supplemental Appropriations	\$ 7,858,576.00	
Payments to County Partnerships:	(\$1,406,840.00)	
Administration at Office of First Steps:	(\$ 288,363.00)	
Administration by County Partnerships:	(\$ 28,967.00)	
Estimated Balance:	\$6,134,406.00	
Program Expenditures/Invoices:		
Instructional	(\$ 817,007.00)	309 Children Funded*
Transportation	(\$ 14,269.00)	45 Children Funded
Supplies & Materials	<u>(\$ 372,600.00)</u>	39 Classrooms Funded
TOTAL:	(\$1,203,876.00)	

* Financial reimbursements were made for 309 eligible children. Three providers received funds to equip classrooms and provide instructional services for five eligible children. However, the providers no longer serve these children so only 304 children were officially served according to the Office of First Steps.

In summary, Table 5 highlights the financial expenditures and provision of services for CDEPP/4K expansion in 2006-07. Again, the following data do not reflect official and verified final expenditures.

**Table 5
CDEPP
Based on Financial Data ALONE**

	Department of Education	Office of First Steps
2006-07 Supplemental Appropriations	\$15,717,104.00	\$ 7,858,576.00
Children Funded	2,932	309
New Classrooms Funded	164	39
Average No. CDEPP Children per Funded Classroom	17.9	7.9
Program Expenditures:		
Instructional	\$9,021,764.00	\$ 817,007.00
Transportation	\$ 245,865.00	\$ 14,269.00
Supplies & Materials	\$1,607,999.44	\$ 372,600.00
Training	\$160,574.65	⁴
TOTAL:	\$11,036,203.09	\$1,203,876.00
Administration		
State	\$96,307.53	\$ 288,363.00
County Partnerships		\$28,967.00
Grants to SCAEYC and SCECA	\$58,485.75	
Estimated Balance:	\$4,526,107.63	\$6,134,406.00

2007-08 Fiscal Year CDEPP/4K Program

Provisos 1.66. and 1.79. of the 2007-08 General Appropriation Act amended the reimbursement system for the CDEPP/4K program accordingly:

- The reimbursement rate for instructional costs for both public and private providers increased from \$3,077 to \$3,931. The proviso requires that private providers be reimbursed on a pro-rata basis determined by the length of the child’s enrollment. In discussions with staff from the Department of Education, public schools will be reimbursed based on a daily rate in Fiscal Year 2007-08 similar to the formula by which private providers were reimbursed in 2006-07.
- Any new CDEPP classrooms will be eligible for the \$10,000 reimbursement for supplies and materials. Established classrooms will be eligible for up to \$2,500 in reimbursements for the “procurement of consumable and other materials.”

⁴ Training is not a separate line item. Training provided to teachers in private settings is part of the agency’s administrative costs included in contractual services and travel. Also, according to OSF, teachers in private settings also attended conferences held by SCAEYC and SCECA.

- Regarding transportation, of the funds provided, the Department of Education may retain up to \$185 per student to defray the cost of transportation. The districts will not receive any supplemental funding for transportation. Private providers transporting children may be eligible for reimbursement of \$550 per eligible child transported.
- There is no longer a restriction that school districts participating in CDEPP must use EIA funds for the original four-year-old childhood development program to fund the teacher salary supplement and fringe.

Conclusions:

- Based upon financial data provided to the EOC by the Department of Education on July 19, 2007 and by the Office of First Steps to School Readiness on June 30, 2007, the state paid for 3,241 children to participate in CDEPP – 2,932 in public schools and 309 in private settings.
- Of the \$23,575,680 that was allocated for the first year of the CDEPP pilot program, approximately \$12,915,166.37 or 55% was expended leaving a carry forward of approximately \$10,660,513.63. The budget surplus is due to at least three factors: (1) non-participation in CDEPP by eight eligible school districts; (2) normal lag time in implementing a new program and in approving eligible private providers; and (3) difficulty in finding and enrolling eligible children in both public and private programs.
- During the first year of the pilot program the financial systems established to reimburse public and private providers were significantly different. The Department of Education used a cumulative enrollment count that did not take into account the child's attendance or membership. On the other hand, private providers were reimbursed based on actual invoices received using a pro-rated student attendance count. The Department of Education will incorporate a daily rate in the second year of the pilot program.
- And, unlike the Department of Education which reimbursed public schools directly through allocations to school districts, private providers received reimbursements directly from the county First Steps partnerships that, in turn, had been allocated funds from the state Office of First Steps. The Office of First Steps did monitor the reimbursement system and collect information on all invoices processed.

Analysis of Student, Teacher, and Provider Data

The public school student and teacher data used for this update are based on the data collections by the State Department of Education (SDE) at approximately three-fourths of the way through the 180-day school year. In the public schools this is referred to as the “135th-day” data collection, and it provides the basis for reporting and adjusting fiscal and membership data for the school year. In most school districts the 135th day of instruction takes place in March or early April. The private CDEPP provider data were provided by the Office of First Steps to School Readiness (OFS) and are based on data through April 2007. Since some private providers did not enroll CDEPP students until the middle of the school year, the data from these providers were collected before the 135th day of instruction. Data from four year old students served 30 hours or more per week in an ABC Voucher child care program were provided by the Department of Social Services (DSS), and data from four year old students enrolled in Head Start programs were provided by the State Head Start Collaboration Office. The DSS and Head Start data are based on May 2007 enrollments. The data files used for this interim report are listed in Table 6.

**Table 6
Sources of Data for 2006-07 Update Report
CDEPP Evaluation**

Category of Information	Type of Information	Source
Student-level information	SASI XP* files from schools and districts (135 th day of school data collection)	SDE
	Listing of CDEPP students	OFS
Information about Program Providers	School information tracking sheets	SDE
	Teacher education and qualifications	SDE
	SASI XP* teacher scheduling files from schools and districts (135 th day of school data collection)	SDE
	Provider information file	OFS
	Teacher information file	OFS
Financial Information	Funding allocations and disbursements	SDE
	Funding allocations and disbursements	OFS
Other Evaluation Information	U.S. Census estimates of four-year-old populations, by county	ORS
	Four-year-olds participating full-time in ABC Voucher child care	DSS
	Four-year-olds participating in Head Start centers, by county	Head Start Collaboration Office

*SASI XP is the electronic database located in public schools.

SDE: S.C. Department of Education

OFS: S.C. Office of First Steps to School Readiness

DSS: S.C. Department of Social Services

ORS: Office of Research and Statistics, S.C. Budget and Control Board

The data reported in this section of the report are based on unduplicated counts of students actively enrolled in the various programs when the data were collected in March, April, or May 2007. These data differ from the cumulative counts listed in the financial information section of this report. The financial information reports the cumulative number of students who generated program funds during the school year. A CDEPP student who enrolled in a program and later withdrew from the program may have moved to a different location and enrolled in the program in a new center or school; this student may have been counted twice in the financial information because the student's enrollments generated program funds at both of the schools or centers attended. A student enrolled in CDEPP who withdrew from the program before the student data were collected would be counted in the financial information, but would not be counted in the student data used in this report. The counts based on unduplicated data from students actively enrolled in the program are thus somewhat lower than the cumulative data from the financial information.

Data Quality

In general, the completeness and accuracy of the 135th-day data regarding CDEPP is quite encouraging compared to the data available for the February interim report. Substantial improvements in data quality and availability have been made over the course of the first year of the pilot program. These improvements represent substantial attention and effort on the part of personnel in the state agencies involved and of the public and private CDEPP providers.

However, some data problems remain to be solved or improved:

- The SASI XP student coding to indicate whether a specific student was eligible for and receiving CDEPP services has improved considerably since the data were reported in the February interim report. However, continued efforts to improve the accuracy of this coding are needed both for financial reporting and for evaluation purposes. For example, in the 135-day data from the 29 CDEPP-participating districts, 224 students ineligible for CDEPP services were coded as participating in the program.
- The unique student identifying numbers (SUNS) required in Proviso 1.75 were not provided for 7.1% (306/4311) of students in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP and were not provided for 5.3% (16/303) of the students in the private provider CDEP programs. This represents a substantial improvement over the data available for the February interim report, where 46% of the public school CDEPP students were missing a SUNS ID, and all of the private CDEP program students were missing a SUNS number. The unique identifying numbers are necessary to follow program participants and non-participants over time to judge the effectiveness of CDEPP and for program and financial accountability, so it is imperative that all students have a unique identifier assigned to them.
- Problems were encountered by both SDE and OFS in collecting or reporting the DIAL3 screening test data from students participating in programs for four year olds, including CDEPP. The DIAL3 results are used by school districts in the process of identifying students having developmental delays, and the DIAL3 results also provide a measure of student characteristics prior to the student's entry to an educational program such as CDEPP. It is part of the evaluation design that the DIAL3 data will be used in the subsequent longitudinal studies of CDEPP and non-CDEPP students, so it is important that the DIAL3 results are available.

Students were assessed by school district personnel at the beginning of the school year, but most student results could not be retrieved successfully from the school databases so they could be downloaded by the SDE. Only 19% of the students in the 29

participating CDEPP districts had DIAL3 scores reported. SDE personnel are investigating the reasons for the problems with the data retrieval, which included the use of a program module in the school databases which school personnel were not accustomed to using and to misunderstandings regarding the data collection. The instructional manuals have since been revised and professional development is underway to improve the collection of this information in 2007-2008. EOC and SDE personnel are currently discussing how the DIAL3 results from 2006-2007 can be made available, which may include direct paper-based data collections from school districts.

Private providers also assessed CDEPP students using DIAL3, but the results are not yet available to the evaluators. The OFS has collected the data for scoring and reporting DIAL3 results on scan sheets and is preparing to scan the data for reporting.

- The data provided from the school databases do not have consistent or complete information regarding students' disabilities and the special education services they receive. Since the disability status of CDEPP students was not available from the public school data, estimates of the need for special education services in the school programs could not be determined. At this time SDE staff are investigating the availability of the information from other school databases. The OFS collects information on the disabilities of CDEPP students in private programs, but not on the special education services the students receive.

Findings

Numbers of CDEPP Providers

Proviso 1.75 directed that funds for the Child Development Education Pilot Program be expended first for children residing in the 8 trial districts, followed by children residing in the remaining plaintiff districts. Thirty-six school districts, including the 8 trial districts, were identified as plaintiff districts in the EOC's March 2006 report on the inventory of four-year-old child development programs. Following a request from the district, the SDE added Orangeburg 4 to the list of plaintiff districts, raising the total number of plaintiff school districts to 37. The 37 identified plaintiff districts and their participation levels in CDEPP are listed in Table 7 (trial districts are identified in bold). Twenty-nine of the 37 plaintiff districts participated in CDEPP and 8 did not. All 8 of the trial districts participated in CDEPP. Among the 29 participating districts, six elected to institute CDEPP in some, but not all, of their schools housing four-year-old child development programs. These districts were allowed to establish CDEPP-funded programs in some schools and maintain their existing EIA-funded pre-kindergarten programs in their remaining schools. A school housing a CDEPP-funded program could not also have an EIA-funded program, and the district's EIA allocation was reduced proportionately to reflect the number of students served in the CDEPP schools.

**Table 7
Plaintiff District Participation in CDEPP**

Plaintiff District	No. Schools Participating in CDEPP	No. Schools NOT Participating in CDEPP
Abbeville	5	0
Allendale	2	0
Bamberg 1*	0	2
Bamberg 2	1	0
Barnwell 19	1	0
Barnwell 29*	0	1
Barnwell 45*	0	1
Berkeley	6	10
Chesterfield*	0	5
Clarendon 1	1	0
Clarendon 2	1	0
Clarendon 3	1	0
Dillon 1	1	0
Dillon 2	3	0
Dillon 3	1	0
Florence 1	2	10
Florence 2	1	0
Florence 3	2	3
Florence 4	1	0
Florence 5	1	0
Hampton 1	2	2
Hampton 2	1	0
Jasper	2	0
Laurens 55	3	3
Laurens 56	2	2
Lee	3	0
Lexington 4	2	0
McCormick*	0	1
Marion 1*	0	1
Marion 2	1	0
Marion 7	2	0
Marlboro*	0	5
Orangeburg 3	4	0
Orangeburg 4	3	0
Orangeburg 5	8	0
Saluda*	0	2
Williamsburg	7	0
Total Schools	70	47

(Trial districts listed in **bold**.)

* Plaintiff district NOT participating in CDEPP.

Eligible four-year-olds residing in the plaintiff districts could attend a CDEPP program provided either by eligible private providers or by the local public school system. There were 36 private providers serving at least one CDEPP-eligible student (Table 8). Thirty-four of these private providers were located in plaintiff school districts and 2 were located in non-plaintiff districts. Eligible students could attend a CDEPP program in a private provider located in a non-plaintiff district, but the student was required to live in a plaintiff district.

Table 8
Number CDEPP Students Served at 135th-day Data Collection - Private Providers

Provider Name	County Location of Provider	Number of CDEPP Students
Little Precious Angels Child Development Center	Bamberg	5
Progressive Family Life Center	Bamberg	5
Bedford's Stay-n-Play	Barnwell	17
Hobbit Hill Preschool	Beaufort	1
Karen Scott Heath CDC	Berkeley	8
The Sunshine House #106	Berkeley	3
The Sunshine House #29	Berkeley	6
The Wee Academy Learning Center	Clarendon	9
Kids Ltd.	Dillon	20
Pee Dee CAP Head Start (Hamer-Canaan)	Dillon	10
Excellent Learning Preschool, Inc.	Florence	6
Pee Dee CAP Head Start (Lake City)	Florence	10
Pee Dee CAP Head Start (Thelma Brown)	Florence	11
The Sunshine House #30	Florence	4
Zion Canaan Child Development Center	Florence	8
Little Smurf's Child Development Center	Georgetown	13
Little People Inc. Day Care	Jasper	6
Bishopville Lee Child Care Center Inc	Lee	15
Lynchburg-Elliott CDC	Lee	14
Kids Konnection Christian Childcare	Marion	9
Little Promises Learning Center	Marion	2
McGill's Bundles of Joy Learning Center	Marion	13
Pee Dee CAP Head Start (Springville)	Marion	10
Troy-Johnson Learning Korner, Inc.	Marion	10
Back to Basics Learning Center, Inc.	Orangeburg	13
Indias Toddler University	Orangeburg	4
Kelly's Kids	Orangeburg	3
Kiddie Kollege of Orangeburg	Orangeburg	2
Kids 2000 Kindergarten & Daycare Center	Orangeburg	2
Kids In Motion	Orangeburg	4
ABC Academy	Saluda	9
Graham's Enhancement Child Care	Williamsburg	9
Mary's Little Lamb Daycare Center	Williamsburg	15
Nesmith Community Day Care Center	Williamsburg	9
Tender Bear's Daycare and Learning Center	Williamsburg	12
Wilson's Daycare and Learning Center	Williamsburg	6
Total		303

Data provided by OFS May 2, 2007.

Numbers of students served

Data for all districts are listed in Appendix D Table 1. This table provides information on the estimates of the numbers of children in each district eligible for CDEPP (e.g., students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch and/or Medicaid services); estimates of the numbers eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program; and the numbers of students served in the various

publicly-funded programs for four-year-old students, including public school child development programs, the public school and private provider CDEP program, the ABC Voucher child care program, and Head Start programs. Data for the 37 public school districts identified as plaintiff districts are listed in Appendix D Table 2, and data for the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP are listed in Appendix D Table 3. Information reported in these tables on the numbers of students served is from the 135th-day data files. When estimates were made, such as the numbers of four-year-olds living in a school district or the numbers of students in a school district eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program, the methodology used is detailed in the earlier EOC report, "Results and Related Recommendations of the Inventory and Study of Four-Year-Old Kindergarten Programs in South Carolina", March 16, 2006.

The district information in Appendix D Tables 1-3 are summarized and comparative information from the 2005-2006 school year are provided in Table 9. The data reported in this table provide answers to several questions about the impact of CDEPP.

Table 9
Summary of Numbers of Students Participating in State-Funded Four-Year-Old Pre-Kindergarten Programs, 2005-06 and 2006-07 School Years
135th-day Data Collection (March-April 2007)

PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT GROUP	ALL 85 DISTRICTS		37 PLAINTIFF DISTRICTS		29 DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN CDEPP**	
	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06
Four-year-old Population Estimate	57,251	56,114	11,642	11,746	9,615	9,731
Children in Poverty* Estimate	36,794	35,010	9,116	9,092	7,515	7,524
Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Estimate	30,495	29,737	7,926	8,016	6,546	6,639
Public School 4K Total Served	20,569	21,145	5,072	5,095	4,311	4,265
Public Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Served Total	13,362	12,871	3,758	3,476	3,254	2,934
Public School Pay Lunch Served	7,199	8,142	1,281	1,564	1,051	1,301
Public School Lunch Status Missing	8	132	6	55	6	30
Public School CDEPP** Served (Student Data File)	2,717	N/A	2,717	N/A	2,717	N/A
Public School CDEPP** Served (Finance Data File)	2,932	N/A	2,932	N/A	2,932	N/A
First Steps CDEPP** Students Served (2006-07 only)	303	N/A	302	N/A	236	N/A
First Steps Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Served (2005-06 only)	N/A	123	N/A	0	N/A	0
Full-Day ABC Voucher Served Estimated	3,471	2,495	738	446	631	391
Head Start Served Estimated	5,806	6,057	1,972	2,008	1,434	1,516
Public School Free/Reduced, 1 st Steps, ABC, Head Start Total	23,559	21,546	6,881	5,930	5,630	4,841
Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch Students NOT Served	6,936	8,191	1,045	2,086	916	1,798

* Children in Poverty include children eligible for the Federal free- or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid services; these students meet the eligibility requirements for participation in the CDEPP program.

**CDEPP = Child Development Education Pilot Program

N/A= Not Applicable.

Data Sources: Student data files and Finance files, S.C. Department of Education; Census population estimates (2006), Office of Research & Statistics, S.C. Budget and Control Board; Birth population estimates (2005), S.C. Department of Health & Environmental Control; S.C. Office of First Steps to School Readiness; S.C. Department of Social Services (ABC Voucher data); S.C. Head Start Collaboration Office

How many four-year-old children are there in South Carolina and in the plaintiff school districts?

The exact number of four-year-old children living in South Carolina at any given time is unknown, but can be estimated using U.S. Census estimates or estimates based on live births. Live birth estimates were used for the 2005-06 school year because they were more contemporaneous than Census data, but newer Census data were available for use in estimating 2006-07 populations. These estimates indicate that the number of four-year-olds living in South Carolina increased in 2006-07 from 56,114 to 57,251. However, the numbers of four-year-olds declined by approximately 100 during this time period in the 37 plaintiff districts and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP. This apparent out-migration or decline in births must be taken into account when attempting to determine if more students were served in child development programs in the plaintiff districts in 2006-2007.

How many four-year-olds are living in poverty?

Statewide, the number of four-year-olds eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch programs and/or for Medicaid services increased by 1,784 to 36,794, reflecting an overall increase in poverty. However, the numbers of four-year-olds in poverty in the 37 plaintiff districts and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP remained relatively stable in 2006-07 compared to 2005-06, perhaps reflecting the existing high levels of poverty among families living in these districts.

How many four-year-olds were attending public school pre-kindergarten programs in April 2007?

There was a small decrease (576 students – from 21,145 in 2005-06 to 20,569 in 2006-07) statewide in the numbers of four-year-olds enrolled in public school pre-kindergarten programs, with a very small decrease in the numbers enrolled in pre-kindergarten programs in the 37 plaintiff districts (23 fewer students) and a moderate increase in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP (46 more students).

What was the socioeconomic status of four-year-olds enrolled in public school pre-kindergarten programs in April 2007?

Information on students' eligibility for the federal free- or reduced-price lunch program was used to address this question. In the February 2007 interim report the interpretation of these data was limited by the extent of missing data in 2006-07. However, the data were nearly complete in the 135-day data collection used for this update, with only 8 public school students missing lunch data statewide; all of the private program CDEPP students had complete information on this variable. The improved data information from 2006-2007 allow a more accurate comparison with the 2005-2006 data listed in Table 9.

There was an increase statewide in the numbers of students eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program who were enrolled in public school pre-kindergarten programs (491 more students in 2006-07 than in 2005-06). A similar increase was observed in the 37 plaintiff districts (282 more students in 2006-07) and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP, where there was an increase of 320 students in 2006-07. This finding may reflect the impact from increased recruiting of students in poverty or increased services provided to students in poverty by CDEPP in these districts. In April 2007, 75.5% (3,254/4,311) of the four year old

students enrolled in the 29 CDEPP-participating school districts were eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program.

There was a decrease statewide of 943 students in the number of students NOT eligible for the Federal lunch program (“pay lunch”) who were served in a public school program in 2006-07 and proportionately larger decreases in the numbers of pay lunch students served in the 37 plaintiff districts (283 fewer students in 2006-07) and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP (250 fewer pay lunch students served in 2006-07). This also may reflect a change in the recruiting and services provided to students in poverty in these districts, since many pay lunch students are not eligible for Medicaid services either, and thus would not be eligible for participation in CDEPP.

What was the socioeconomic status of four-year-olds enrolled in private CDEPP pre-kindergarten programs in April 2007?

The percentage of CDEPP students enrolled in private centers who were eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program was similar to that of public school participants: 73.6% (223/303) eligible for the private center participants compared to 75.5% for public school participants. All of the CDEPP students in the private centers met the income eligibility requirements for participation.

How many four-year-olds participated in CDEPP in April 2007?

Two sets of numbers for public school CDEPP participation are listed in Table 9: one is based on the identification of students actively enrolled in the school on the 135th day of instruction in the student data file from the school databases (“Student Data File”), and one is based on the numbers of students for whom providers were reimbursed (“Finance Data File”). There is a discrepancy between these numbers (2,717 served according to the school databases vs. 2,932 served according to the financial data) which reflects the differences between the cumulative financial counts and the “snapshot” of students actually enrolled in the schools at the 135th day of instruction.

Further examination of the student 135th-day data revealed that, in addition to the 2,717 eligible students currently enrolled, an additional 188 students had been enrolled earlier in the school year but had withdrawn from the school before the 135th day of instruction; these 188 students were counted in the cumulative financial data but not in the “snapshot” of students enrolled at the 135th day. Ten more students had duplicate records in the school databases and were apparently counted in the totals funded; the duplicate records were removed from the 135th-day counts. The duplicate records may have resulted from recording the students more than one time in the school databases and are data entry errors. The data are still being examined to resolve the remaining 17-student discrepancy between the fiscal and enrollment counts.

The 188 students who withdrew from schools during the year represent 6.5% of the public school students participating in CDEPP. This is a measure of the mobility of the students (some of the students withdrew from one school and enrolled in another), suggesting that there is a very modest level of mobility among public school CDEPP participants.

The number of four-year-olds participating in First Steps private provider CDEPP programs is 303 (based on student enrollment data provided on May 2, 2007). All of the students met the income eligibility requirements for CDEPP: one student was listed as residing in a non-plaintiff school district and would thus not be eligible for CDEPP (the data for this student are currently

being reviewed by OFS staff to determine the student's eligibility). The Office of First Steps reported funding 309 students in CDEPP as of June 22, 2007; this is also a cumulative count. The Office of First Steps indicates that it collects enrollment information from private providers on a continuous basis.

There were a total of 3,020 students (2,717 in public schools, 303 in private centers) enrolled in CDEPP at the time of the 135th-day data collection (April 2007). Based on the finance data, a cumulative total of 3,241 students (2,932 in public schools, 309 in private centers) participated at some time during the 2006-2007 school year by the 135th day of instruction.

How many four-year-olds participated in other publicly-funded full-day programs in April 2007?

The number of four-year-olds receiving full-day child care services through the ABC voucher program increased by 976 students statewide, by 292 students in the 37 plaintiff districts, and by 240 students in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP. The number of four-year-olds participating in Head Start statewide decreased slightly and also declined in the plaintiff and CDEPP-participating districts.

Were more eligible students served with publicly-funded public and private full-day pre-kindergarten programs in the 37 plaintiff districts and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP in 2006-07 than in 2005-06?

Yes, more students living in the plaintiff districts eligible for the Federal lunch program were served in a publicly-funded pre-kindergarten program in 2006-07: 951 (from 5,930 in 2005-2006 to 6,881 in 2006-2007) more students were served in the 37 plaintiff districts, and 789 (from 4,841 to 5,630) more students were served in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP. The state-level data also showed an increase of 2013 total students eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program served statewide in a publicly-funded pre-kindergarten program (from 21,546 in 2005-06 to 23,559 in 2006-07).

The statewide number of four-year-olds eligible for the free- or reduced-price lunch program who were NOT served in a publicly-funded program decreased to 6,936 students in 2006-07 compared to 8,191 in 2005-06, while the numbers of eligible students NOT served in the 37 plaintiff districts and in the 29 plaintiff districts participating in CDEPP decreased by 1,041 students and by 882 students, respectively.

What are the demographic characteristics of CDEPP-participating students?

The distributions of gender, ethnicity, and eligibility for Limited English Proficient (LEP) services among CDEPP-participating students in public and private settings are shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Demographic Characteristics of CDEPP Students
135-day Data Collection, 2006-2007 School Year

Variable	Demographic Characteristic	Number of CDEPP Students in Public Schools (%)	Number of CDEPP Students in Private Centers (%)
Gender	Female	1,334 (49.1)	145 (47.9)
	Male	1,383 (50.9)	158 (52.1)
	Subtotal	2,717 (100)	303 (100)
Ethnicity	African American	1,798 (66.2)	272 (89.8)
	American Indian	4 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
	Asian	9 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
	Hispanic	197 (7.3)	5 (1.7)
	White	701 (25.8)	16 (5.3)
	Other/Unknown	8 (0.2)	10 (3.3)
	Subtotal	2,717 (100)	303 (100)
LEP Eligibility	Eligible for LEP Services	95 (3.5)	NA*
	Not Eligible	2622 (96.5)	NA
	Subtotal	2,717 (100)	NA

Percentage totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

*Eligibility for LEP services not available; all students indicated as English speakers, with 1 student indicated as having Spanish for "Other Language."

The percentages of male and female CDEPP students are similar, with a slightly higher percentage of males enrolled than females, especially in the private centers.

Almost two-thirds (66.2%) of public school CDEPP students are African American, compared to almost 90% of students receiving CDEPP services from private providers. More than one-third of public school CDEPP students are White, while only 5% of CDEPP students in private centers are White. The percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in CDEPP provided in public schools is also higher than the percentage of CDEPP students in private centers.

None of the CDEPP students in programs provided by private providers were indicated as eligible for LEP services, while 95 (3.5%) of the CDEPP students in public schools were eligible. The English language proficiency of students who have a primary language other than English is evaluated by public school personnel. The evaluation results determine student eligibility for LEP services if such services are available. Students attending CDEP programs provided by private providers may not have been evaluated for their eligibility for such programs; the apparent lack of LEP-eligible students in private centers may also reflect the choices made by non-English speaking families in the placement of their children in preschool programs. The OFS guidelines for the 2007-2008 CDEP program will direct private providers to collaborate with local school districts in the evaluation and provision of services for students whose home language is other than English.

Programs for LEP children are supported largely by federal Title III funds. At this time no Title III funds are available in South Carolina for LEP services to preschool children. Some school districts provide these language services for preschool children; these programs are funded using local or other sources of funds. In 2006-2007, 3.5% of the four year old students attending CDEPP in public schools were eligible for LEP services, but the data provided do not indicate how many actually were provided such services. Demographic projections indicate that

the numbers of children in South Carolina who have a language other than English as their primary language will increase substantially over the next several years. The need for educational programs to help these students acquire English language skills sufficient to meet the academic challenges of the State's standards-based educational system should be a consideration in the future implementation of state-funded preschool programs.

As indicated earlier in this report, accurate and comprehensive information on CDEPP student disabilities and the disability-related educational services they received was not available from the public school data at this time. Four of the students participating in CDEPP provided by private providers were indicated as having Individualized Education Plans (IEP) related to their disabilities. OFS guidelines for CDEPP also direct private providers to collaborate with local districts in the identification and provision of services to CDEPP students having disabilities.

What is the average class size of CDEPP classrooms?

This question can be addressed only for public school CDEPP classrooms because information on the total numbers of students served (CDEPP-eligible and non-CDEPP eligible) in classrooms in which CDEPP students were enrolled was not available at this time for the private centers. The information is also not complete for all public school CDEPP programs because some schools and one school district (Florence 2) did not report the teacher data needed to identify the students enrolled in each classroom in the 135-day data collection. However, data from 159 public school CDEPP classrooms were available for analysis for this report.* At the time of the 135th-day data collection the average public school CDEPP classroom contained 17.9 students. The smallest total class size was 6 students and the largest was 21 students. The average number of CDEPP-eligible students in these classrooms was 15.8, with a range of 2 to 20 students. The average number of students in these classrooms who were not eligible for CDEPP was 2.1, with a range from 0 ineligible students to 10. These data indicate that there is a moderate level of economic diversity among students enrolled in public school classrooms containing CDEPP-eligible students. There is some evidence from the evaluations of the Georgia preschool programs and from other studies that heterogeneous classroom settings provide educational benefits to academically at-risk students.

The data available from CDEPP programs provided by private providers did provide information on the average number of CDEPP students enrolled per private center (classroom data were not available). The average center enrolled 8.4 CDEPP students, with a range from a minimum of 1 student to a maximum of 20 students per center.*

*(Note: differences between the fiscal and student class size averages reported reflect the respective cumulative and "snapshot" characteristics of these data.)

Section III. Update of Issues Identified from Interim Evaluation of CDEPP Start-Up

The February 2007 interim CDEPP evaluation report raised several issues revealed by the data collected from the early start-up activities for the first year of the pilot. Those issues included:

- Concerns about the poor quality of program and student data;
- Need for marketing the program to parents and providers to expand participation in the program, revealed by the projected funding surplus for the program;
- Per-child and transportation reimbursement levels in the first year of the pilot may have been insufficient to make the program sufficiently attractive to some potential providers;
- The program's high teacher requirements and the facilities requirements were identified by some program administrators as barriers to expansion;
- More information from a second year of the pilot was needed to better inform future legislation.

Some of those issues are already being addressed. The quality of the data available increased substantially by the 135th day of instruction data collection, although some data quality issues remain. Proviso 1.66 to the 2007-2008 General Appropriations Act extended the pilot CDEPP through 2007-2008. Proviso 1.66 also increased the per-child reimbursement from \$3,077 to \$3,931 and provided additional funding for student transportation and for classroom materials. Proviso 1.66 continued the EOC's CDEPP evaluation responsibilities and expanded the evaluation to include the assessment of facility availability for full-day programs for four year old children.

This update to the interim evaluation report confirms the need to focus on those issues and adds some additional issues for consideration:

1. The funding surplus from the first year of the CDEPP pilot emphasizes the need for increased marketing of the CDEP program to parents and potential program providers. Of the \$23,575,680 that was allocated for the first year of the CDEPP pilot program, approximately \$12,915,166.37 or 55% was expended leaving a carry forward of approximately \$10,660,513.63. The budget surplus is due to at least three factors: (1) non-participation in CDEPP by eight eligible school districts; (2) normal lag time in implementing a new program and in approving eligible private providers; and (3) difficulty in finding and enrolling eligible children in both public and private programs. Information on the numbers of providers anticipated in 2007-2008 and projections of the numbers of students to be served are anticipated by the SDE and OFS by late July 2007; this information was not available at the time this report was drafted.
2. The quality and completeness of the 2006-2007 program data improved substantially by the time of the April 2007 data collection. The improvement in quality of the data can be attributed to the efforts on the part of state agency and local provider personnel during the year, and demonstrates that accurate and comprehensive data for early childhood programs can be collected. Some data quality and availability issues remain, however, and the issue needs continued attention. For example, not all students have been assigned the necessary unique student identifier needed for program evaluation and record-keeping. DIAL3 screening assessments were conducted by school and provider personnel, but problems with the collection of those results by the state agencies for evaluation purposes need to be solved. Information on students with disabilities and on Limited English Proficient (LEP) students is currently either not available or incomplete.

3. While the data are incomplete, it is clear that some of the students enrolled in CDEPP also have disabilities and/or are not native speakers of English (LEP students). Students with disabilities may also be eligible for CDEPP if their families meet the income or Medicaid requirements. The level of participation in CDEPP of students having disabilities is not clear from the available data nor is information on the kinds of educational services CDEPP participants with disabilities are receiving. The role of full-day pre-kindergarten programs in the education of preschool children with disabilities should be examined in the planning of future state-funded preschool programs.

In 2006-2007, 3.5% of the four year old students attending CDEPP in public schools were eligible for LEP services, but the data provided do not indicate how many actually were provided such services. Demographic projections indicate that the numbers of children in South Carolina who have a language other than English as their primary language will increase substantially over the next several years. The need for educational programs to help these students acquire English language skills sufficient to meet the academic challenges of the State's standards-based educational system should be a consideration in the future implementation of state-funded preschool programs.

More in-depth review of the issues of providing language and special education services to CDEPP students will be conducted for the January 1, 2008 evaluation report to the General Assembly.

IV. Evaluation Activities for FY2007-2008

The CDEPP evaluation includes both an examination of the process variables involved in the implementation of the program, such as agency policies and curriculum, teacher, and facilities requirements, and outcomes such as scores on the state standards-based tests in third grade and beyond based on longitudinal data from CDEPP participants and non-participants. The interdisciplinary evaluation team is composed of EOC staff members (Dr. Jo Anne Anderson, David Potter, and Melanie Barton) and University of South Carolina personnel (Drs. Bill Brown, Kathy Paget, Jon Pierce, Fred Greer, and Ms. Heather Googe). In addition to the data and document analyses and the surveys of district superintendents and private providers reported in the February 2007 interim evaluation report, the evaluators have been engaged in additional survey data collection and analysis and the pilot-testing of CDEPP students. The following activities are planned for the 2007-2008 fiscal year:

1. Evaluators pilot-tested a developmentally appropriate assessment protocol for child outcome measures in the spring of 2007 with 48 children in CDEPP programs and they are currently compiling and analyzing the results;
2. The evaluators will pilot-test a developmentally appropriate assessment to be administered to the same group of 48 children in Spring 2008, when they are enrolled in five year old kindergarten;
3. Administering the previously pilot-tested child outcome measures with an initial cohort of 100 four-year-old children in CDEPP and non-CDEPP programs in the fall of 2007;
4. Evaluators surveyed CDEPP teachers and administrators in both public and private CDEPP programs at the end of the 2006-2007 school year, and are currently compiling and analyzing the survey results, which will be included in the January 1, 2008 evaluation report to the General Assembly. Evaluators will be soliciting information from a sample of parents in Spring 2008 regarding their participation in CDEPP;
5. In compliance with Proviso 1.66 of the 2007-2008 General Appropriations Act, the evaluators will expand their evaluation activities to include "an assessment, by county, on the availability and use of existing public and private classroom capacity approved for at-risk four-year-old kindergarten students. The report shall include, by county, the estimated four-year-old population, the total number of CDEPP approved four-year-old kindergarten spaces available, the number of four-year-old children enrolled in both public and private CDEPP approved facilities, and the number of children on waiting lists for either public or private providers during the reporting period. Where possible, the report shall also include anticipated four-year-old kindergarten enrollment projections for the two years following the report." The evaluation team may be expanded to include an expert on school facilities. This information is also to be included in the January 1, 2008 report to the General Assembly;
6. The evaluators will be compiling and analyzing new fiscal and student and programmatic data for the 2007-2008 pilot year and preparing the January 1, 2008 report to the General Assembly;
7. Pending evaluation funding, the evaluators will assess 100 four-year-old pre-kindergarten children each year for 2008, 2009, and 2010 (i.e., total sample of 448 preschoolers across four years of proposed evaluation) and re-assessment of those children in five-year-old kindergarten (i.e., total sample of 348 kindergarteners across four of evaluation years) to assess short-term child outcomes related to CDEPP; and
8. Pending evaluation funding, the evaluators will determine the relationship of CDEPP participation on children's PACT scores as they enter third grade.

APPENDIX A:
Provisos 1.66 and 1.79 of the 2007-2008 General Appropriations Act

1.66. (SDE: Child Development Education Pilot Program) There is created the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program. This program shall be available for the 2007-2008 school year on a voluntary basis and shall focus on the developmental and learning support that children must have in order to be ready for school and must incorporate parenting education.

(A) For the 2007-2008 school year, with funds appropriated by the General Assembly, the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program shall first be made available to eligible children from the following eight trial districts in Abbeville County School District et. al. vs. South Carolina: Allendale, Dillon 2, Florence 4, Hampton 2, Jasper, Lee, Marion 7, and Orangeburg 3. With any remaining funds available, the pilot shall be expanded to the remaining plaintiff school districts in Abbeville County School District et. al. vs. South Carolina. Priority shall be given to implementing the program first in those of the plaintiff districts which participated in the pilot program during the 2006-2007 school year, then in the plaintiff districts having proportionally the largest population of underserved at-risk four-year-old children. During the implementation of the pilot program, no funds appropriated by the General Assembly for this purpose shall be used to fund services to at-risk four-year-old children residing outside of the trial or plaintiff districts.

The Education Oversight Committee shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot program and shall issue a report to the General Assembly by January 1, 2008. The report shall include a comparative evaluation of children served in the pilot program and children not served in the pilot program. Additionally, based on the evaluation of the pilot program, the Education Oversight Committee shall include recommendations for the creation of and an implementation plan for phasing in the delivery of services to all at-risk four-year-old children in the state.

Unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year for this program shall be carried forward and shall remain in the program. In rare instances, students with documented kindergarten readiness barriers may be permitted to enroll for a second year, or at age five, at the discretion of the Department of Education for students being served by a public provider or at the discretion of the Office of South Carolina First Steps to School Readiness for students being served by a private provider.

(B) Each child residing in the pilot districts, who will have attained the age of four years on or before September 1, of the school year, and meets the at-risk criteria is eligible for enrollment in the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program for one year.

The parent of each eligible child may enroll the child in one of the following programs:

- (1) a school-year four-year-old kindergarten program delivered by an approved public provider; or
- (2) a school-year four-year-old kindergarten program delivered by an approved private provider.

The parent enrolling a child must complete and submit an application to the approved provider of choice. The application must be submitted on forms and must be accompanied by a copy of the child's birth certificate, immunization documentation, and documentation of the student's eligibility as evidenced by family income documentation showing an annual family income of 185% or less of the federal poverty guidelines as promulgated annually by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services or a statement of Medicaid eligibility.

In submitting an application for enrollment, the parent agrees to comply with provider attendance policies during the school year. The attendance policy must state that the program consists of 6.5 hours of instructional time daily and operates for a period of not less than 180

days per year. Pursuant to program guidelines, noncompliance with attendance policies may result in removal from the program.

No parent is required to pay tuition or fees solely for the purpose of enrolling in or attending the program established under this provision. Nothing in this provision prohibits charging fees for childcare that may be provided outside the times of the instructional day provided in these programs.

(C) Public school providers choosing to participate in the South Carolina Four-Year-Old Child Development Kindergarten Program must submit an application to the Department of Education. Private providers choosing to participate in the South Carolina Four-Year-Old Child Development Kindergarten Program must submit an application to the Office of First Steps. The application must be submitted on the forms prescribed, contain assurances that the provider meets all program criteria set forth in this provision, and will comply with all reporting and assessment requirements.

Providers shall:

- (1) comply with all federal and state laws and constitutional provisions prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability, race, creed, color, gender, national origin, religion, ancestry, or need for special education services;
- (2) comply with all state and local health and safety laws and codes;
- (3) comply with all state laws that apply regarding criminal background checks for employees and exclude from employment any individual not permitted by state law to work with children;
- (4) be accountable for meeting the education needs of the child and report at least quarterly to the parent/guardian on his progress;
- (5) comply with all program, reporting, and assessment criteria required of providers;
- (6) maintain individual student records for each child enrolled in the program to include, but not be limited to, assessment data, health data, records of teacher observations, and records of parent or guardian and teacher conferences;
- (7) designate whether extended day services will be offered to the parents/guardians of children participating in the program;
- (8) be approved, registered, or licensed by the Department of Social Services; and
- (9) comply with all state and federal laws and requirements specific to program providers.

Providers may limit student enrollment based upon space available. However if enrollment exceeds available space, providers shall enroll children with first priority given to children with the lowest scores on an approved pre-kindergarten readiness assessment. Private providers shall not be required to expand their programs to accommodate all children desiring enrollment.

However, providers are encouraged to keep a waiting list for students they are unable to serve because of space limitations.

(D) The Department of Education and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall:

- (1) develop the provider application form;
- (2) develop the child enrollment application form;
- (3) develop a list of approved research-based preschool curricula for use in the program based upon the South Carolina Content Standards, provide training and technical assistance to support its effective use in approved classrooms serving children;
- (4) develop a list of approved pre-kindergarten readiness assessments to be used in conjunction with the program, provide assessments and technical assistance to support assessment administration in approved classrooms serving children;
- (5) establish criteria for awarding new classroom equipping grants;
- (6) establish criteria for the parenting education program providers must offer;

- (7) establish a list of early childhood related fields that may be used in meeting the lead teacher qualifications;
- (8) develop a list of data collection needs to be used in implementation and evaluation of the program;
- (9) identify teacher preparation program options and assist lead teachers in meeting teacher program requirements;
- (10) establish criteria for granting student retention waivers; and
- (11) establish criteria for granting classroom size requirements waivers.

(E) Providers of the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program shall offer a complete educational program in accordance with age-appropriate instructional practice and a research based preschool curriculum aligned with school success. The program must focus on the developmental and learning support children must have in order to be ready for school. The provider must also incorporate parenting education that promotes the school readiness of preschool children by strengthening parent involvement in the learning process with an emphasis on interactive literacy.

Providers shall offer high-quality, center-based programs that must include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

- (1) employ a lead teacher with a two-year degree in early childhood education or related field or be granted a waiver of this requirement from the Department of Education or the Office of First Steps to School Readiness;
- (2) employ an education assistant with pre-service or in-service training in early childhood education;
- (3) maintain classrooms with at least 10 four-year-old children, but no more than 20 four-year-old children with an adult to child ratio of 1:10. With classrooms having a minimum of 10 children, the 1:10 ratio must be a lead teacher to child ratio. Waivers of the minimum class size requirement may be granted by the South Carolina Department of Education for public providers or by the Office of First Steps to School Readiness for private providers on a case-by-case basis;
- (4) offer a full day, center-based program with 6.5 hours of instruction daily for 180 school days;
- (5) provide an approved research-based preschool curriculum that focuses on critical child development skills, especially early literacy, numeracy, and social/emotional development;
- (6) engage parents' participation in their child's educational experience that shall include a minimum of two documented conferences per year; and
- (7) adhere to professional development requirements outlined in this article.

(F) Every classroom providing services to four-year-old children established pursuant to this provision must have a lead teacher with at least a two-year degree in early childhood education or related field and who is enrolled and is demonstrating progress toward the completion of a teacher education program within four years. Every classroom must also have at least one education assistant per classroom who shall have the minimum of a high school diploma or the equivalent, and at least two years of experience working with children under five years old. The teaching assistant shall have completed the Early Childhood Development Credential (ECD) 101 or enroll and complete this course within twelve months of hire.

(G) The General Assembly recognizes there is a strong relationship between the skills and preparation of pre-kindergarten instructors and the educational outcomes of students. To improve these education outcomes, participating providers shall require all personnel providing instruction and classroom support to students participating in the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program to participate annually in a minimum of 15 hours of professional development to include teaching children from poverty. Professional development should provide instruction in strategies and techniques to address the age-appropriate progress

of pre-kindergarten students in developing emergent literacy skills, including but not limited to, oral communication, knowledge of print and letters, phonemic and phonological awareness, and vocabulary and comprehension development.

(H) Both public and private providers shall be eligible for transportation funds for the transportation of children to and from school. Nothing within this provision prohibits providers from contracting with another entity to provide transportation services provided the entities adhere to the requirements of Section 56-5-195. Providers shall not be responsible for transporting students attending programs outside the district lines. Parents choosing program providers located outside of their resident district shall be responsible for transportation. When transporting four-year-old child development students, providers shall make every effort to transport them with students of similar ages attending the same school. Of the amount appropriated for the program, not more than \$185 per student shall be retained by the Department of Education for the purposes of transporting four-year-old students. This amount must be increased annually by the same projected rate of inflation as determined by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Budget and Control Board for the Education Finance Act.

(I) For all private providers approved to offer services pursuant to this provision, the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall:

- (1) serve as the fiscal agent;
- (2) verify student enrollment;
- (3) recruit, review, and approve eligible providers. In considering approval of providers, consideration must be given to the provider's availability of permanent space for program service and whether temporary classroom space is necessary to provide services to any children;
- (4) coordinate oversight, monitoring, technical assistance, coordination, and training for classroom providers;
- (5) serve as a clearing house for information and best practices related to four-year-old kindergarten programs;
- (6) receive, review, and approve new classroom grant applications and make recommendations for approval based on approved criteria;
- (7) coordinate activities and promote collaboration with other private and public providers in developing and supporting four-year-old kindergarten programs;
- (8) maintain a database of the children enrolled in the program; and
- (9) promulgate guidelines as necessary for the implementation of the pilot program.

(J) For all public school providers approved to offer services pursuant to this provision, the Department of Education shall:

- (1) serve as the fiscal agent;
- (2) verify student enrollment eligibility;
- (3) recruit, review, and approve eligible providers. In considering approval of providers, consideration must be given to the provider's availability of permanent space for program service and whether temporary classroom space is necessary to provide services to any children;
- (4) coordinate oversight, monitoring, technical assistance, coordination, and training for classroom providers;
- (5) serve as a clearing house for information and best practices related to four-year-old kindergarten programs;
- (6) receive, review, and approve new classroom grant applications and make recommendations for approval based on approved criteria;
- (7) coordinate activities and promote collaboration with other private and public providers in developing and supporting four-year-old kindergarten programs;
- (8) maintain a database of the children enrolled in the program; and
- (9) promulgate guidelines as necessary for the implementation of the pilot program.

(K) The General Assembly shall provide funding for the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program. For the 2007-08 school year, the funded cost per child shall be \$3,931 increased annually by the rate of inflation as determined by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Budget and Control Board for the Education Finance Act. Eligible students enrolling with private providers during the school year shall be funded on a pro-rata basis determined by the length of their enrollment. Private providers transporting eligible children to and from school shall be eligible for a reimbursement of \$550 per eligible child transported. Providers who are reimbursed are required to retain records as required by their fiscal agent. With funds appropriated by the General Assembly, the Department of Education shall approve grants for public providers and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall approve grants for private providers, of up to \$10,000 per class for the equipping of new classrooms. Funding of up to two thousand five hundred dollars may be provided annually for the procurement of consumable and other materials in established classrooms.

(L) Pursuant to this provision, the Department of Social Services shall:

- (1) maintain a list of all approved public and private providers; and
- (2) provide the Department of Education, the Office of First Steps, and the Education Oversight Committee information necessary to carry out the requirements of this provision.

(M) The Education Oversight Committee shall conduct a comparative evaluation of the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program and issue their findings in a report to the General Assembly by January 1, 2008. Based on information, data, and evaluation results, the Education Oversight Committee shall include as part of their report recommendations for the creation and implementation of a statewide four-year-old kindergarten program for at-risk children. The report shall also include information and recommendations on lead teacher qualifications and options for creating comparable salary schedules for certified teachers employed by private providers. In the current fiscal year, the Education Oversight Committee shall use funds appropriated by the General Assembly for four-year-old evaluation to support the annual collection of and continuous evaluation of data.

The report shall also include an assessment, by county, on the availability and use of existing public and private classroom capacity approved for at-risk four-year-old kindergarten students. The report shall include, by county, the estimated four-year-old population, the total number of CDEPP approved four-year-old kindergarten spaces available, the number of four-year-old children enrolled in both public and private CDEPP approved facilities, and the number of children on waiting lists for either public or private providers during the reporting period. Where possible, the report shall also include anticipated four-year-old kindergarten enrollment projections for the two years following the report.

To aid in this evaluation, the Education Oversight Committee shall determine the data necessary and both public and private providers are required to submit the necessary data as a condition of continued participation in and funding of the program. This data shall include developmentally appropriate measures of student progress. Additionally, the Department of Education shall issue a unique student identifier for each child receiving services from a private provider. The Department of Education shall be responsible for the collection and maintenance of data on the public state funded full day and half-day four-year-old kindergarten programs. The Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall be responsible for the collection and maintenance of data on the state funded programs provided through private providers. The Education Oversight Committee shall use this data and all other collected and maintained data necessary to conduct a research based review of the program's implementation and assessment of student success in the early elementary grades.

1.79. (SDE: Child Development Education Pilot Program-4 Year Olds) \$4,000,000 of the funds carried forward from the prior fiscal year from the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program are designated for services to zero to three year olds by the Office of First Steps, the remaining funds shall be redirected for use by the Department of Education for services to four year olds participating in the Child Development Education Pilot Program during the current fiscal year. At the discretion of the First Steps Board of Trustees, funds carried forward by the Office of First Steps may be also be used to match philanthropic gifts targeting low income 0-3 year olds statewide.

**APPENDIX B-1
Department of Education -CDEPP
Allocations to School Districts**

Allocation to Department of Education

\$15,717,104.00

Allocations to School Districts -- Public Providers:

	Actual Students Funded	Classrooms	Instruction	Transportation	Supplies & Materials	Training & Meetings	TOTAL
District							
Abbeville	86	6	\$264,622	\$7,030	\$59,666.10	\$2,253.35	\$333,571.45
Allendale	91	6	\$280,007	\$13,135	\$59,488.87	\$4,112.91	\$356,743.78
Bamberg 2	43	2	\$132,311	\$4,440	\$20,000.00	\$2,128.55	\$158,879.55
Barnwell 19	20	1	\$61,540	\$2,220	\$10,000.00	\$509.80	\$74,269.80
Berkeley	218	10	\$670,786	\$29,600	\$94,763.98	\$24,106.67	\$819,256.65
Clarendon 1	50	3	\$153,850	\$7,770	\$30,000.00	\$3,335.46	\$194,955.46
Clarendon 2	104	5	\$320,008	\$7,585	\$49,287.10	\$2,005.35	\$378,885.45
Clarendon 3	43	3	\$132,311	\$5,550	\$28,754.04	\$1,123.75	\$167,738.79
Dillon 1	38	2	\$116,926	\$2,960	\$19,968.05	\$2,373.08	\$142,227.13
Dillon 2	150	7	\$461,550	\$9,065	\$67,500.00	\$1,690.80	\$539,805.80
Dillon 3	75	5	\$230,775	\$5,920	\$48,925.00	\$5,252.42	\$290,872.42
Florence 1	103	6	\$316,931	\$13,875	\$60,000.00	\$12,770.34	\$403,576.34
Florence 2	59	4	\$181,543	\$10,915	\$40,000.00	\$2,973.28	\$235,431.28
Florence 3	43	3	\$132,311	\$2,220	\$29,769.30	\$441.53	\$164,741.83
Florence 4	59	3	\$181,543	\$9,065	\$28,695.14	\$2,008.63	\$221,311.77
Florence 5	51	3	\$156,927	\$5,550	\$22,768.94	\$1,240.62	\$186,486.56
Hampton 1	96	5	\$295,392	\$11,655	\$49,994.49	\$5,323.26	\$362,364.75
Hampton 2	40	2	\$123,080	\$0	\$19,995.52	\$2,148.35	\$145,223.87
Jasper	156	8	\$480,012	\$19,610	\$79,751.16	\$2,198.38	\$581,571.54
Laurens 55	139	9	\$427,703	\$9,435	\$86,556.51	\$6,241.05	\$529,935.56

Allocation to Department of Education

\$15,717,104.00

Allocations to School Districts -- Public Providers:

	Actual Students Funded	Classrooms	Instruction	Transportation	Supplies & Materials	Training & Meetings	TOTAL
District							
Laurens 56	67	3	\$206,159	\$4,070	\$30,000.00	\$3,019.70	\$243,248.70
Lee	107	5	\$329,239	\$13,320	\$50,000.00	\$4,967.57	\$397,526.57
Lexington 4	137	7	\$421,549	\$1,480	\$70,000.00	\$1,620.91	\$494,649.91
Marion 2	106	6	\$326,162	\$5,735	\$59,870.00	\$1,404.70	\$393,171.70
Marion 7	55	3	\$169,235	\$8,880	\$28,791.99	\$3,530.01	\$210,437.00
Orangeburg 3	171	9	\$526,167	\$6,475	\$90,000.00	\$7,181.31	\$629,823.31
Orangeburg 4	131	9	\$403,087	\$3,885	\$90,000.00	\$6,690.90	\$503,662.90
Orangeburg 5	275	16	\$846,175	\$1,110	\$156,868.05	\$36,404.54	\$1,040,557.59
Williamsburg	219	13	\$673,863	\$23,310	\$126,585.20	\$9,815.94	\$833,574.14
Pee Dee						\$1,415.80	\$1,415.80
Other Plaintiff Districts (Bamberg 1, Barnwell 29, McCormick)						\$285.69	\$285.69
TOTAL:	2,932	164	\$9,021,764	\$245,865	\$1,607,999.44	\$160,574.65	\$11,036,203.09
Services and Training Activities Purchased by SDE							\$96,307.53
Grants to SCAEYC & SCECA							\$58,485.75
BALANCE:							\$4,526,107.63

APPENDIX B-2
Department of Education -CDEPP
Grants for Supplies and Materials for New Classrooms

#	District	Amount Paid	# Classrooms	Total # Students	Average Per Classroom
1	Abbeville	\$59,666.10	6	86	14.3
2	Allendale	\$59,488.87	6	91	15.2
3	Bamberg 2	\$20,000.00	2	43	21.5
4	Barnwell 19	\$10,000.00	1	20	20.0
5	Berkeley	\$94,763.98	10	218	21.8
6	Clarendon 1	\$30,000.00	3	50	16.7
7	Clarendon 2	\$49,287.10	5	104	20.8
8	Clarendon 3	\$28,754.04	3	43	14.3
9	Dillon 1	\$19,968.05	2	38	19.0
10	Dillon 2	\$67,500.00	7	150	21.4
11	Dillon 3	\$48,925.00	5	75	15.0
12	Florence 1	\$60,000.00	6	103	17.2
13	Florence 2	\$40,000.00	4	59	14.8
14	Florence 3	\$29,769.30	3	43	14.3
15	Florence 4	\$28,695.14	3	59	19.7
16	Florence 5	\$22,768.94	3	51	17.0
17	Hampton 1	\$49,994.49	5	96	19.2
18	Hampton 2	\$19,995.52	2	40	20.0
19	Jasper	\$79,751.16	8	156	19.5
20	Laurens 55	\$86,556.51	9	139	15.4
21	Laurens 56	\$30,000.00	3	67	22.3
22	Lee	\$50,000.00	5	107	21.4
23	Lexington 4	\$70,000.00	7	137	19.6
24	Marion 2	\$59,870.00	6	106	17.7
25	Marion 7	\$28,791.99	3	55	18.3
26	Orangeburg 3	\$90,000.00	9	171	19.0
27	Orangeburg 4	\$90,000.00	9	131	14.6
28	Orangeburg 5	\$156,868.05	16	275	17.2
29	Williamsburg	\$126,585.20	13	219	16.8
	TOTAL:	\$1,607,999.44	164	2,932	17.9
	Mean per District:		\$55,448		
	Mean per Classroom:		\$9,805		

APPENDIX B-3
Department of Education -CDEPP
Reimbursements for Transportation

#	District	SDE		2006-07 Students Transported
		Projected	Actual	
		Transportation	Transportation	
		Allocations *	Allocations *	
1	Abbeville	\$22,200	\$7,030	38
2	Allendale	\$13,320	\$13,135	71
3	Bamberg 2	\$7,400	\$4,440	24
4	Barnwell 19	\$3,700	\$2,220	12
5	Berkeley	\$11,100	\$29,600	160
6	Clarendon 1	\$11,100	\$7,770	42
7	Clarendon 2	\$22,200	\$7,585	41
8	Clarendon 3	\$11,100	\$5,550	30
9	Dillon 1	\$7,400	\$2,960	16
10	Dillon 2	\$7,400	\$9,065	49
11	Dillon 3	\$10,175	\$5,920	32
12	Florence 1	\$18,500	\$13,875	75
13	Florence 2	\$14,800	\$10,915	59
14	Florence 3	\$7,400	\$2,220	12
15	Florence 4	\$10,175	\$9,065	49
16	Florence 5	\$11,100	\$5,550	30
17	Hampton 1	\$3,700	\$11,655	63
18	Hampton 2	\$7,400	\$0	0
19	Jasper	\$14,800	\$19,610	106
20	Laurens 55	\$11,100	\$9,435	51
21	Laurens 56	\$3,700	\$4,070	22
22	Lee	\$3,700	\$13,320	72
23	Lexington 4	\$11,100	\$1,480	8
24	Marion 2	\$19,240	\$5,735	31
25	Marion 7	\$3,700	\$8,880	48
26	Orangeburg 3	\$7,400	\$6,475	35
27	Orangeburg 4	\$7,400	\$3,885	21
28	Orangeburg 5	\$7,400	\$1,110	6
29	Williamsburg	\$3,700	\$23,310	126
	TOTAL:	\$293,410	\$245,865	1,329

* Initial projections by the Department of Education for travel.

APPENDIX C
Office of First Steps--CDEPP
Updated through June 30, 2007

Total Appropriation to First Steps:								\$7,858,576					
			Verified	Projected Expenditures *				Sent to County	Actual				Cost Per Child
Program Name	City	County	Students	Instruction	Materials	Transport	TOTAL	Partnerships	Instruction	Materials	Transport	Invoices Paid	Per Provider
Kids Under Construction **	Abbeville	Abbeville	3	\$9,231	\$10,000	\$555	\$19,786	\$20,000	\$1,709	\$9,946		\$ 11,655	\$3,885
Family Affair Child Care Center **	N. Augusta	Aiken	1	\$2,930	\$10,000		\$12,930	\$11,000	\$256	\$9,852		\$ 10,109	\$10,109
	Allendale	Allendale						\$0					
Little Precious Angels Child Development Center	Bamberg	Bamberg	5	\$15,385	\$10,000	\$925	\$26,310	\$40,000	\$16,068	\$6,057		\$ 22,125	\$4,425
Progressive Family Life	Bamberg	Bamberg	4	\$12,308	\$10,000	\$740	\$23,048		\$4,529	\$8,155		\$ 12,684	\$3,171
Bedford's Stay-n-Play	Barnwell	Barnwell	16	\$49,232	\$10,000	\$2,960	\$62,192	\$59,616	\$44,700	\$9,719		\$ 54,420	\$3,401
Hobbit Hill	Beaufort	Beaufort	1	\$3,077	\$10,000	\$185	\$13,262	\$15,000		\$9,385		\$ 9,385	\$9,385
Karen Scott Health CDC	Goose Creek	Berkeley	8	\$24,616	\$10,000	\$1,480	\$36,096	\$70,770	\$20,428	\$6,177		\$ 26,605	\$3,326
The Sunshine House #29	N Charleston	Berkeley	6	\$18,462	\$10,000	\$1,110	\$29,572		\$9,486	\$9,823		\$ 19,309	\$3,218
The Sunshine House #106	Monck's Corner	Berkeley	3	\$9,231	\$10,000	\$555	\$19,786		\$10,598	\$9,806		\$ 20,405	\$6,802
		Charleston						\$0					
The Wee Academy Learning Center	Manning	Clarendon	9	\$27,693	\$10,000	\$1,665	\$39,358	\$45,770	\$27,863	\$9,237		\$ 37,100	\$4,122
Kids Ltd.	Dillon	Dillon	20	\$61,540	\$10,000	\$3,700	\$75,240	\$80,000	\$44,273	\$9,874	\$940	\$ 55,088	\$2,754
Pee Dee CAP Headstart (Hamer-Canaan)	Dillon	Dillon	10	\$30,770	\$10,000	\$1,850	\$42,620		\$6,838	\$9,930	\$411	\$ 17,179	\$1,718
Zion Canaan Child Development Center	Timmons ville	Florence	8	\$24,616	\$10,000	\$1,480	\$36,096	\$152,848	\$36,602	\$149		\$ 36,751	\$4,594
Excellent Learning Preschool, Inc.	Florence	Florence	6	\$18,462	\$10,000	\$1,110	\$29,572		\$15,128	\$8,850		\$ 23,978	\$3,996
The Sunshine House #30	Florence	Florence	4	\$12,308	\$10,000	\$740	\$23,048		\$5,641			\$ 5,641	\$1,410
Pee Dee CAP Headstart (Thelma Brown)	Florence	Florence	11	\$33,847	\$10,000	\$2,035	\$45,882		\$14,547	\$9,889	\$884	\$ 25,320	\$2,302
Pee Dee CAP Headstart (Lake City)	Lake City	Florence	10	\$30,770	\$10,000	\$1,850	\$42,620		\$16,838	\$10,000	\$1,013	\$ 27,850	\$2,785
Little Smurf's Child Development Center	Andrews	Georgetown	13	\$40,001	\$10,000	\$2,405	\$52,406	\$65,240	\$44,615	\$9,835	\$2,683	\$ 57,134	\$4,395
The Mellon Patch**	East Hampton	Hampton	1	\$3,077	\$10,000	\$185	\$13,262	\$13,462	\$1,196	\$9,999		\$ 11,196	\$11,196
Little People Inc. Daycare	Jasper	Jasper	5	\$15,385	\$10,000	\$925	\$26,310	\$28,078	\$12,735	\$9,423		\$ 22,158	\$4,432
Bishopville Lee Child Care Center Inc.	Bishopville	Lee	15	\$46,155	\$10,000	\$2,775	\$58,930	\$133,390	\$48,889	\$9,780		\$ 58,669	\$3,911

Total Appropriation to First Steps:						\$7,858,576							
			Verified	Projected Expenditures *				Sent to County	Actual				Cost Per Child
Program Name	City	County	Students	Instruction	Materials	Transport	TOTAL	Partnerships	Instruction	Materials	Transport	Invoices Paid	Per Provider
Lynchburg-Elliott CDC ***	Lynchburg	Lee	14	\$43,078	\$10,000	\$2,590	\$55,668		\$44,274	\$19,922		\$ 64,196	\$4,585
Tiny Junction Inc **	Chapin	Lexington	1	\$3,077	\$10,000	\$185	\$13,262	\$12,815	\$684	\$9,812	\$41	\$ 10,537	\$10,537
Little Promises Learning Center	Mullins	Marion	2	\$6,154	\$10,000	\$370	\$16,524	\$175,000	\$4,615	\$9,998		\$ 14,614	\$7,307
Troy Johnson Learning Center	Mullins	Marion	10	\$30,770	\$10,000	\$1,850	\$42,620		\$26,513	\$9,996	\$1,594	\$ 38,103	\$3,810
McGills Bundles of Joy	Marion	Marion	13	\$40,001	\$10,000	\$2,405	\$52,406		\$31,111	\$9,742		\$ 40,853	\$3,143
Kids Konnection Christian Childcare	Marion	Marion	9	\$27,693	\$10,000	\$1,665	\$39,358		\$14,872	\$9,997		\$ 24,869	\$2,763
Pee Dee CAP Headstart (Springville)	Marion	Marion	10	\$30,770	\$10,000	\$1,850	\$42,620		\$14,188	\$9,717	\$853	\$ 24,758	\$2,476
Back to Basics Learning Center, Inc.	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	12	\$36,924	\$10,000	\$2,220	\$49,144	\$158,930	\$39,487	\$9,379		\$ 48,867	\$4,072
India's Toddler University	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	4	\$12,308	\$10,000	\$740	\$23,048		\$16,012	\$8,444	\$509	\$ 24,965	\$6,241
Kelly's Kids	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	3	\$9,231	\$10,000	\$555	\$19,786		\$7,863	\$9,008		\$ 16,871	\$5,624
Kids in Motion	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	4	\$12,308	\$10,000	\$740	\$23,048		\$12,478	\$7,491		\$ 19,970	\$4,992
Kiddie Kollege of Orangeburg	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	2	\$6,154	\$10,000	\$370	\$16,524		\$2,906	\$5,542		\$ 8,448	\$4,224
Kids 2000 Kindergarten & Daycare Center	Orangeburg	Orangeburg	2	\$6,154	\$10,000	\$370	\$16,524		\$4,957	\$7,964		\$ 12,922	\$6,461
ABC Academy	Saluda	Saluda	9	\$27,693	\$10,000	\$1,665	\$39,358	\$41,441	\$25,641	\$9,993	\$504	\$ 36,138	\$4,015
Mary's Little Lamb Daycare Center	Kingstree	Williamsburg	18	\$55,386	\$10,000	\$3,330	\$68,716	\$283,480	\$57,949	\$10,000	\$1,326	\$ 69,275	\$3,849
Tender Bear's Daycare and Learning Center	Greeleyville	Williamsburg	13	\$40,001	\$10,000	\$2,405	\$52,406		\$49,744	\$10,000	\$154	\$ 59,898	\$4,608
Nesmith Community Day Care Center	Nesmith	Williamsburg	9	\$27,693	\$10,000	\$1,665	\$39,358		\$34,274	\$10,000	\$2,061	\$ 46,335	\$5,148
Wilson's Daycare and Learning Center ***	Kingstree	Williamsburg	6	\$18,462	\$10,000	\$1,110	\$29,572		\$21,538	\$20,000	\$1,295	\$ 42,834	\$7,139
Graham's Enhancement Child Care	Kingstree	Williamsburg	9	\$27,693	\$10,000	\$1,665	\$39,358		\$24,957	\$9,707		\$ 34,664	\$3,852
			309	\$950,646	\$400,000	\$56,980	\$1,407,626	\$1,406,840	\$817,007	\$372,600	\$14,269	\$1,203,876	\$3,896

* Based on \$3,077 per child for instruction, \$10,000 per center for materials and equipment, and \$185 per child for transportation

** No longer serve kids; therefore, total number of kids served to-date is 303

**APPENDIX D, TABLE 1: Numbers of Four-Year-Old Students Served in State-Funded Preschool Programs
2006-2007 School Year, All School Districts
135-Day Unduplicated Counts**

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
ABBEVILLE	72.48	313	227	196	121	81	40	0	33.1	84	86	0	69	6	159	159	161
AIKEN	63.12	1926	1216	1015	784	516	268	0	34.2				155	102	778		
ALLEDALE	94.19	175	165	153	81	76	5	0	6.2	76	91	0	42	19	137	137	152
ANDERSON 1	47.77	662	316	232	242	134	108	0	44.6				62	38	249		
ANDERSON 2	59.61	289	172	129	91	11	80	0	87.9				34	21	66		
ANDERSON 3	71.44	204	146	119	61	21	40	0	65.6				29	17	90		
ANDERSON 4	58.98	217	128	97	92	54	38	0	41.3				25	15	96		
ANDERSON 5	60.33	939	566	453	178	146	32	0	18				111	68	332		
BAMBERG 1*	74.32	148	110	85	52	21	31	0	59.6	0	0	5	35	13	81	53	53
BAMBERG 2	95.72	91	87	84	39	36	3	0	7.7	37	43	3	28	10	78	78	84
BARNWELL 19	89.57	65	58	55	20	18	2	0	10	19	20	0	22	4	45	45	46
BARNWELL 29*	75.32	69	52	45	29	21	8	0	27.6	0	0	1	20	4	46	25	25
BARNWELL 45*	70.67	187	132	110	80	61	19	0	23.8	0	0	16	50	9	136	75	75
BEAUFORT	59.83	1936	1158	956	629	314	315	0	50.1				146	49	580		
BERKELEY	65.34	2163	1413	1117	696	396	300	0	43.1	269	218	16	229	103	764	617	566
CALHOUN	89.25	188	168	159	91	77	14	0	15.4				9	9	95		
CHARLESTON	62.61	4690	2936	2443	1599	1183	416	0	26				388	370	1941		
CHEROKEE	69.21	785	543	464	355	200	155	0	43.7				80	47	349		
CHESTER	72.34	491	355	291	162	106	56	0	34.6				193	36	338		
CHESTERFIELD*	74.13	609	451	386	271	172	99	0	36.5	0	0	0	150	20	344	170	170
CLARENDON 1	96.8	85	82	77	52	50	2	0	3.8	50	50	1	27	6	84	84	84
CLARENDON 2	85.53	259	222	192	110	86	24	0	21.8	93	104	8	74	17	192	192	203
CLARENDON 3	67.83	101	69	56	58	40	18	0	31	40	43	0	23	5	68	68	71
COLLETON	85.12	585	498	428	241	192	49	0	20.3				117	21	333		
DARLINGTON	78.04	901	703	601	281	221	60	0	21.4				227	69	526		
DILLON 1	81.66	76	62	58	40	32	8	0	20	36	38	0	15	8	59	59	61
DILLON 2	89.87	323	290	267	141	136	5	0	3.5	139	150	29	70	37	275	275	286
DILLON 3	76.96	138	106	92	83	64	19	0	22.9	69	75	0	26	13	108	108	114

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
DORCHESTER 2	47.84	1276	610	414	387	138	249	0	64.3			1	63	74	282		
DORCHESTER 4	86.09	151	130	111	105	78	26	1	25				14	16	110		
EDGEFIELD	69.02	312	215	188	124	89	35	0	28.2				32	8	129		
FAIRFIELD	90.24	323	291	263	172	141	31	0	18				40	6	188		
FLORENCE 1	66.48	1247	829	694	397	286	111	0	28	87	103	20	138	84	532	329	345
FLORENCE 2	75.64	99	75	65	78	59	17	2	22.4	59	59	1	12	8	80	80	80
FLORENCE 3	89.72	316	284	266	146	124	20	2	13.9	40	43	9	47	29	210	125	128
FLORENCE 4	89.95	84	76	67	57	56	1	0	1.8	56	59	9	13	8	86	86	89
FLORENCE 5	65.34	121	79	66	64	37	27	0	42.2	37	51	0	13	8	58	58	72
GEORGETOWN	72.46	771	559	481	363	263	100	0	27.5				67	36	397		
GREENVILLE	52.67	5452	2872	2189	1552	1000	551	1	35.5				308	267	1575		
GREENWOOD 50	65.68	730	479	401	353	142	211	0	59.8				145	40	327		
GREENWOOD 51	69.69	94	66	52	35	21	14	0	40				20	6	47		
GREENWOOD 52	56.6	132	75	58	52	26	26	0	50				23	6	55		
HAMPTON 1	74.71	200	149	122	178	114	64	0	36	79	96	0	27	11	152	117	134
HAMPTON 2	93.48	97	91	83	40	40	0	0	0	40	40	0	16	6	62	62	62
HORRY	66.3	2732	1811	1520	1260	941	319	0	25.3				100	147	1352		
JASPER	91.7	310	284	257	159	142	17	0	10.7	142	156	9	36	19	206	206	220
KERSHAW	61.71	800	494	402	233	132	101	0	43.3				73	3	208		
LANCASTER	62.65	889	557	438	196	150	46	0	23.5				85	30	266		
LAURENS 55	72.11	516	372	306	339	207	132	0	38.9	120	139	0	47	22	282	189	208
LAURENS 56	76.68	293	225	194	126	108	18	0	14.3	64	67	0	29	13	155	106	109
LEE	96.83	270	261	249	98	98	0	0	0	98	107	29	65	42	234	234	243
LEXINGTON 1	41.82	1212	507	368	378	95	283	0	74.9				46	76	226		
LEXINGTON 2	68.45	558	382	323	292	104	188	0	64.4				34	57	236		
LEXINGTON 3	69.17	133	92	79	82	40	42	0	51.2				8	14	65		
LEXINGTON 4	78.12	211	165	142	181	141	40	0	22.1	149	137	0	15	25	189	189	177
LEXINGTON 5	33.17	1041	345	244	153	85	68	0	44.4				31	52	168		
MCCORMICK*	86.51	108	93	79	32	25	7	0	21.9	0	0	0	44	3	72	47	47
MARION 1*	85.19	266	227	204	113	86	27	0	23.9	0	0	34	54	27	201	115	115
MARION 2	91.17	170	155	140	93	68	25	0	26.9	68	106	10	37	18	133	133	171

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
<i>MARION 7</i>	96.63	75	72	68	50	46	4	0	8	48	55	0	17	9	74	74	81
MARLBORO*	90.12	399	360	325	144	122	22	0	15.3	0	0	1	110	16	249	127	127
NEWBERRY	70.8	543	384	333	184	133	51	0	27.7				109	27	269		
OCONEE	63.05	785	495	409	207	182	25	0	12.1				60	63	312		
<i>ORANGEBURG 3</i>	92.16	299	276	244	178	153	25	0	14	154	171	0	42	16	212	212	229
ORANGEBURG 4	79.69	378	301	264	175	120	55	0	31.4	120	131	3	46	18	187	187	198
ORANGEBURG 5	88.55	635	562	518	296	251	43	2	14.6	251	275	25	86	33	395	395	419
PICKENS	54.4	1223	665	519	478	291	187	0	39.1				89	59	453		
RICHLAND 1	76.46	2449	1873	1564	850	703	147	0	17.3				202	271	1195		
RICHLAND 2	48.73	2129	1037	827	383	184	199	0	52				112	150	464		
SALUDA*	73.04	241	176	146	40	23	17	0	42.5	0	0	9	75	15	122	99	99
SPARTANBURG 1	57.68	371	214	171	181	83	98	0	54.1				20	21	124		
SPARTANBURG 2	55.26	718	397	315	287	110	177	0	61.7				37	39	187		
SPARTANBURG 3	64.9	243	158	124	97	77	20	0	20.6				15	16	108		
SPARTANBURG 4	62.72	229	144	116	137	85	52	0	38				14	14	113		
SPARTANBURG 5	54.18	524	284	206	174	92	82	0	47.1				27	28	147		
SPARTANBURG 6	58.02	767	445	365	160	134	26	0	16.3				42	44	221		
SPARTANBURG 7	73.34	621	455	396	279	218	61	0	21.9				43	45	311		
SUMTER 2	78.17	888	694	618	299	212	87	0	29.1				144	54	425		
SUMTER 17	72.57	873	634	572	280	183	97	0	34.6				132	49	378		
UNION	72.77	351	255	216	160	87	73	0	45.6				73	23	186		
WILLIAMSBURG	94.7	505	478	454	215	189	26	0	12.1	193	219	64	107	34	398	398	424
YORK 1	63.15	364	230	187	178	52	126	0	70.8			0	10	26	105		
YORK 2	40.9	394	161	122	259	88	171	0	66				7	18	113		
YORK 3	54.07	1195	646	508	305	32	273	0	89.5				28	73	133		
YORK 4	22.3	523	117	83	56	11	45	0	80.4				5	13	30		
UNKNOWN												0	16		16	16	16
TOTAL		57251	36794	30495	20569	13362	7199	8	35	2717	2932	303	5806	3471	23559	5729	5944

* Plaintiff district NOT participating in CDEPP program.

** Children in Poverty includes children eligible for the Federal free- or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid services.

BOLD type face indicates plaintiff district; *italicized* type face indicates trial district.

**APPENDIX D, TABLE 2: Numbers of Four-Year-Old Students Served in State-Funded Preschool Programs
2006-2007 School Year, 37 Plaintiff School Districts
135-Day Unduplicated Counts**

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
ABBEVILLE	72.48	313	227	196	121	81	40	0	33.1	84	86	0	69	6	159	159	161
ALLEDALE	94.19	175	165	153	81	76	5	0	6.2	76	91	0	42	19	137	137	152
BAMBERG 1*	74.32	148	110	85	52	21	31	0	59.6	0	0	5	35	13	81	53	53
BAMBERG 2	95.72	91	87	84	39	36	3	0	7.7	37	43	3	28	10	78	78	84
BARNWELL 19	89.57	65	58	55	20	18	2	0	10	19	20	0	22	4	45	45	46
BARNWELL 29*	75.32	69	52	45	29	21	8	0	27.6	0	0	1	20	4	46	25	25
BARNWELL 45*	70.67	187	132	110	80	61	19	0	23.8	0	0	16	50	9	136	75	75
BERKELEY	65.34	2163	1413	1117	696	396	300	0	43.1	269	218	16	229	103	764	617	566
CHESTERFIELD*	74.13	609	451	386	271	172	99	0	36.5	0	0	0	150	20	344	170	170
CLARENDON 1	96.8	85	82	77	52	50	2	0	3.8	50	50	1	27	6	84	84	84
CLARENDON 2	85.53	259	222	192	110	86	24	0	21.8	93	104	8	74	17	192	192	203
CLARENDON 3	67.83	101	69	56	58	40	18	0	31	40	43	0	23	5	68	68	71
DILLON 1	81.66	76	62	58	40	32	8	0	20	36	38	0	15	8	59	59	61
DILLON 2	89.87	323	290	267	141	136	5	0	3.5	139	150	29	70	37	275	275	286
DILLON 3	76.96	138	106	92	83	64	19	0	22.9	69	75	0	26	13	108	108	114
FLORENCE 1	66.48	1247	829	694	397	286	111	0	28	87	103	20	138	84	532	329	345
FLORENCE 2	75.64	99	75	65	78	59	17	2	22.4	59	59	1	12	8	80	80	80
FLORENCE 3	89.72	316	284	266	146	124	20	2	13.9	40	43	9	47	29	210	125	128
FLORENCE 4	89.95	84	76	67	57	56	1	0	1.8	56	59	9	13	8	86	86	89
FLORENCE 5	65.34	121	79	66	64	37	27	0	42.2	37	51	0	13	8	58	58	72
HAMPTON 1	74.71	200	149	122	178	114	64	0	36	79	96	0	27	11	152	117	134
HAMPTON 2	93.48	97	91	83	40	40	0	0	0	40	40	0	16	6	62	62	62
JASPER	91.7	310	284	257	159	142	17	0	10.7	142	156	9	36	19	206	206	220
LAURENS 55	72.11	516	372	306	339	207	132	0	38.9	120	139	0	47	22	282	189	208
LAURENS 56	76.68	293	225	194	126	108	18	0	14.3	64	67	0	29	13	155	106	109
LEE	96.83	270	261	249	98	98	0	0	0	98	107	29	65	42	234	234	243
LEXINGTON 4	78.12	211	165	142	181	141	40	0	22.1	149	137	0	15	25	189	189	177

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
MCCORMICK*	86.51	108	93	79	32	25	7	0	21.9	0	0	0	44	3	72	47	47
MARION 1*	85.19	266	227	204	113	86	27	0	23.9	0	0	34	54	27	201	115	115
MARION 2	91.17	170	155	140	93	68	25	0	26.9	68	106	10	37	18	133	133	171
<i>MARION 7</i>	96.63	75	72	68	50	46	4	0	8	48	55	0	17	9	74	74	81
MARLBORO*	90.12	399	360	325	144	122	22	0	15.3	0	0	1	110	16	249	127	127
<i>ORANGEBURG 3</i>	92.16	299	276	244	178	153	25	0	14	154	171	0	42	16	212	212	229
ORANGEBURG 4	79.69	378	301	264	175	120	55	0	31.4	120	131	3	46	18	187	187	198
ORANGEBURG 5	88.55	635	562	518	296	251	43	2	14.6	251	275	25	86	33	395	395	419
SALUDA*	73.04	241	176	146	40	23	17	0	42.5	0	0	9	75	15	122	99	99
WILLIAMSBURG	94.7	505	478	454	215	189	26	0	12.1	193	219	64	107	34	398	398	424
UNKNOWN												0	16		16	16	16
TOTAL		11642	9116	7926	5072	3785	1281	6	25.3	2717	2932	302	1972	738	6881	5729	5944

* Plaintiff district NOT participating in CDEPP program.

** Children in Poverty includes children eligible for the Federal free- or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid services.

BOLD type face indicates plaintiff district; *italicized* type face indicates trial district

**APPENDIX D, TABLE 3: Numbers of Four-Year-Old Students Served in State-Funded Preschool Programs
2006-2007 School Year, 29 School Districts Participating in Child Development Education Program (CDEPP)
135-Day Unduplicated Counts**

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
ABBEVILLE	72.48	313	227	196	121	81	40	0	33.1	84	86	0	69	6	159	159	161
ALLEDALE	94.19	175	165	153	81	76	5	0	6.2	76	91	0	42	19	137	137	152
BAMBERG 2	95.72	91	87	84	39	36	3	0	7.7	37	43	3	28	10	78	78	84
BARNWELL 19	89.57	65	58	55	20	18	2	0	10	19	20	0	22	4	45	45	46
BERKELEY	65.34	2163	1413	1117	696	396	300	0	43.1	269	218	16	229	103	764	617	566
CLARENDON 1	96.8	85	82	77	52	50	2	0	3.8	50	50	1	27	6	84	84	84
CLARENDON 2	85.53	259	222	192	110	86	24	0	21.8	93	104	8	74	17	192	192	203
CLARENDON 3	67.83	101	69	56	58	40	18	0	31	40	43	0	23	5	68	68	71
DILLON 1	81.66	76	62	58	40	32	8	0	20	36	38	0	15	8	59	59	61
DILLON 2	89.87	323	290	267	141	136	5	0	3.5	139	150	29	70	37	275	275	286
DILLON 3	76.96	138	106	92	83	64	19	0	22.9	69	75	0	26	13	108	108	114
FLORENCE 1	66.48	1247	829	694	397	286	111	0	28	87	103	20	138	84	532	329	345
FLORENCE 2	75.64	99	75	65	78	59	17	2	22.4	59	59	1	12	8	80	80	80
FLORENCE 3	89.72	316	284	266	146	124	20	2	13.9	40	43	9	47	29	210	125	128
FLORENCE 4	89.95	84	76	67	57	56	1	0	1.8	56	59	9	13	8	86	86	89
FLORENCE 5	65.34	121	79	66	64	37	27	0	42.2	37	51	0	13	8	58	58	72
HAMPTON 1	74.71	200	149	122	178	114	64	0	36	79	96	0	27	11	152	117	134
HAMPTON 2	93.48	97	91	83	40	40	0	0	0	40	40	0	16	6	62	62	62
JASPER	91.7	310	284	257	159	142	17	0	10.7	142	156	9	36	19	206	206	220
LAURENS 55	72.11	516	372	306	339	207	132	0	38.9	120	139	0	47	22	282	189	208
LAURENS 56	76.68	293	225	194	126	108	18	0	14.3	64	67	0	29	13	155	106	109
LEE	96.83	270	261	249	98	98	0	0	0	98	107	29	65	42	234	234	243
LEXINGTON 4	78.12	211	165	142	181	141	40	0	22.1	149	137	0	15	25	189	189	177
MARION 2	91.17	170	155	140	93	68	25	0	26.9	68	106	10	37	18	133	133	171
MARION 7	96.63	75	72	68	50	46	4	0	8	48	55	0	17	9	74	74	81
ORANGEBURG 3	92.16	299	276	244	178	153	25	0	14	154	171	0	42	16	212	212	229
ORANGEBURG 4	79.69	378	301	264	175	120	55	0	31.4	120	131	3	46	18	187	187	198
ORANGEBURG 5	88.55	635	562	518	296	251	43	2	14.6	251	275	25	86	33	395	395	419

DISTRICT	2006 Poverty Index	Census Population Estimate	Estimated Children in Poverty**	Estimated Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program	Public School Total 4K Served 2006-07	Public School Total Free or Reduced Served	Public School Pay Lunch Served	Public School Lunch Data Missing	Percent Public School 4K Served Pay Lunch	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Student Data File)	Total Public School CDEPP Served (Finance Data File)	Total First Steps CDEPP Students Served	Total Estimated Head Start Served	Total Estimated ABC Voucher Served	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps, Head Start, Free or Reduced)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Student Data File)	Total Served (ABC Voucher First Steps Head Start, Public School Finance Data File)
WILLIAMSBURG	94.7	505	478	454	215	189	26	0	12.1	193	219	64	107	34	398	398	424
UNKNOWN												0	16		16	16	16
TOTAL		9615	7515	6546	4311	3254	1051	6	24.4	2717	2932	236	1434	631	5630	5018	5233

** Children in Poverty includes children eligible for the Federal free- or reduced-price lunch program and/or Medicaid services.
BOLD type face indicates plaintiff district; *italicized* type face indicates trial district.

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director (803) 734-6148.