

FINDINGS OF SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT THREE SCHOOL FACILITY NEEDS FOCUS GROUPS

FACILITATED BY
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

CONTENTS

Project summary	1
Methodology.....	1
Participants' Perceptions of the District	1
Participants' Perceptions of the School Building Proposal.....	2
Participants' Perceptions of the Cost	2
Communications Recommendations	3
Appendix 1	
Spartanburg School District Three School Facility Needs Focus Group Response Notes	4
Appendix 2	
SCSBA Detailed Bond Referenda Report	6

Project Summary

Spartanburg School District Three, with assistance from the South Carolina School Boards Association, conducted two focus groups to gauge the knowledge and general level of support of the district's conceptual "Future Ready Schools" plans. The conceptual plans were developed over a year-long process that included an Education Space Review with input from teachers and staff.

The concept, which was presented to the Board of Trustees on October 18, 2018, has been discussed with district citizens at three public town hall meetings conducted by Superintendent Kenny Blackwood. The concept focuses on the following:

- Consolidation of Cowpens Middle School and the Middle School of Pacolet
- Construction of a new, state-of-the-art middle school that is centrally located in the district
- Renovations to all other existing schools to address safety and security and technological needs

Working with SCSBA, the school district invited 20 diverse community and student leaders from both the Cowpens and Pacolet areas to participate in focus groups. A total of 13 participants of diverse ages, ethnicities and races made up of parents, a student and business and community leaders provided input on the district's facility needs and plan. The small group sizes allowed more time for participants to share their individual thoughts and to discuss them with each other. Input was based on participants' knowledge or perceptions, and their collective responses will be used as a factor for considering the following:

- General support for the school building proposals currently under consideration as a result of an Education Space Review conducted last year;
- General support for the estimated costs to address facility needs; and
- Information that should be included in referendum messaging to ensure voters are fully informed.

Methodology

Two focus group sessions, each including participants from the Pacolet and Cowpens communities, were conducted on Monday, November 12 and focused on the following questions:

1. Quickly. Name the top strength of the district that comes to your mind.
2. Quickly. Name the top weakness of the district that comes to your mind.
3. For the past year, the district has been studying the condition and efficiency of its school buildings. The district has also been observing the growth and construction of new schools in some of the surrounding school districts. As a result of its findings, the district is studying a couple of proposals. Both proposals would result in the closing of two, 64-year-old middle schools. We would like your perception and thoughts on these ideas.

One proposal is to build one new, state-of-the-art middle school that is centrally-located within the district.

The second proposal is to build one state-of-the-art middle school AND make safety, classroom and technology renovations to all elementary schools and the high school.

Hearing the two proposals and without all of the fine details, in general ...

Is there one proposal that you would strongly support and why?

Is there another proposal that voters would more strongly support and why?

4. Proposal one (middle school only) is estimated to cost about \$38 to \$40 million, which may mean a tax increase of about \$129 a year or \$10.77 a month or .35 cents per day for the owner of a \$100,000 home.

Proposal two (middle school and other renovations) is estimated to cost about \$55 to \$58 million and may mean about \$197 a year, \$16.43 a month or .54 cents per day for the owner of a \$100,000 home.

Given the estimated cost and tax increase of the two proposals, how would you respond to the following:

Yes or no: I believe Spartanburg Three voters would overwhelmingly support a \$38 to \$40 million bond referendum to pay for the construction of a new middle school.

If you said no, why? If you said yes, why?

Yes or no: I believe Spartanburg Three voters would overwhelming support a \$55 to \$58 million bond referendum to pay for the construction of a middle school and renovations to all elementary schools and high school.

If you said no, why? If you said yes, why?

5. One proposed location for the new middle school is Clifdale Elementary (one of four elementary schools). Clifdale Elementary would be torn down and the new middle school built on that site.

Yes or no: Would you and other voters support this location? Why or why not.

If no, what locations would you and other voters support?

Participants' Perceptions of the District

In general, participants were very positive when talking about the school district and the education it provides students. They used various words to describe their perceptions and experiences including "every student is known and valued," "unity" and "there is a respect between parents and teachers." There is a strong sense of community and pride in their local schools. Many shared they could walk their children to school, which is something they value.

While the relatively smaller size of the school district and smaller classroom sizes were cited as a top strength,

many also agreed that the smaller size could also be a weakness when considering the limited educational programs that could be offered to students at the middle and high schools. One participant cited the foreign language offering often changed from year to year.

Most importantly, no participant cited any trust or credibility concerns regarding the district's finances, leadership or programming, which are critical factors in considering whether or not to seek voter approval of a bond referendum. However, when discussing the placement of a new middle school in a centrally-located area of the district, the conversation immediately turned to a past incident regarding the placement of the high school. Participants stated that while the district "promised" the high school would be centrally located, it was ultimately not located in a central location. This will be a key factor for the board's consideration.

Participants cited a number of the district's strengths, including

- All students have opportunities to participate in sports and other activities.
- This is a special place.
- Students really like the district (they don't want to leave).
- Friendliness of students and staff.

When it comes to weaknesses, many of participants had to take time to think about the question, which could be viewed as a general satisfaction of the school district or complacency. Most participants recognized that factors outside of the district greatly impact the district, including a low tax base that results in lower revenue for the district, lack of business development and "people holding onto land so it can't be developed." Some of the weaknesses of the districts that were cited included:

- Need to update technology.
- Age of buildings.
- Not enough exposure for students to experience opportunities outside of the school district (life experiences).
- Not enough exposure of academic program offerings for students (limited high school courses for middle school students).
- Teacher and staff retention/shortages.
- Higher student poverty rates than in surrounding school districts.

Participants' Perceptions of the School Building Proposals

Many of the participants were unaware or had limited information regarding the building proposals currently being considered by the district. During the discussion, many of the participants shared their knowledge about existing facilities in the district and were generally supportive of efforts to improve existing facilities.

Interestingly, concerns about the consolidation of the two middle schools did not dominate the conversations. Most participants had questions about how the existing facilities would be used if a new middle school was built. One participant advocated for the construction of a new high school, which would "attract residential growth" and for the

existing high school to become the consolidated middle school. Two participants advocated for the renovation of the existing middle schools.

A majority of participants did not favor the proposal to construct only a middle school. Most believe the proposal should include the construction of a middle school and improvement to all other schools. Some of the top issues and concerns cited by the participants regarding the proposal were:

- Central location of the new middle school.
- Assurances that class sizes would remain small and that individual attention to students would not be lost.
- Assurances that no teacher or staff would lose their jobs.
- Clear plan for the use of the existing middle schools once they are closed.

Participants were very clear on the question of locating the new middle school on the Clifdale Elementary School property. Not one participant expressed support or a willingness to hear more about the idea. The lingering issue concerning the location of the high school was again expressed.

Interestingly, safety did not dominate as an issue in conversations regarding the building proposals. While school safety is important, most did not express a belief that their schools are unsafe.

A majority of participants, however, were aware of the new schools being constructed and school improvements underway in surrounding school districts.

None of the participants said they think the district's student enrollment is increasing. Many were concerned that it is decreasing and are worried about the impact it would have on future programs, and expressed concern that consolidation talks would surface.

Participants' Perceptions of the Costs

Most of the participants did not express a belief that voters would overwhelmingly support the estimated increase in taxes for either building proposal; however, a majority were hesitant to say a referendum would fail. A few expressed concerns that the cost would be too high for voters to support. One participant expressed concern that the district would continually ask for more money if the referendum passed. The recent passage of a referendum to increase taxes for the Converse Fire District was also raised as a concern that voters may be reluctant to approve an additional tax increase.

A majority expressed support for a referendum which included the construction of a new middle school and renovations to other schools.

Also raised as concerns in regards to the cost of the proposals include:

- A clear explanation of how the district calculated the estimated increase in taxes for the cost of both proposals (figures do not seem to add up according to one participant).

- Cost information concerning the construction of the new middle school versus renovations to existing middle schools need to be clear.

Communications Recommendations

- Address the lack of understanding of how bonds work and how the tax increase would impact homeowners in a simple way (break it down to yearly, monthly, weekly and daily).
- Need more spotlight on information regarding the operational costs of two smaller sized middle schools and the savings that could result with a combined middle school.
- Need specific information about program offerings and/or changes to operations (team teaching, collaborative spaces, etc.) that will improve for middle and high school students with a new middle school. Staff, parents and students need to understand what will be different and how it benefits them.
- State how one middle school could provide student unity.
- Need to communicate what specifically each school will receive if voters approve a bond referendum.
- In addition to communicating the benefits of a new middle school, information must also include statements about class sizes and the retention of all staff.
- If possible, identify a location for the new middle school before the bond referendum and ensure the location is clearly communicated.
- If possible, develop and communicate a plan for the use of the existing middle schools once a new middle school is constructed.
- Information should focus on how a new school could benefit economic development that helps to increase the tax base and provide more revenue to the school district and benefit students.
- Information concerning if the capacity of existing elementary and high schools can accommodate future growth and/or the potential to accommodate changes to learning (project-based learning, collaborative spaces, etc.).

Other

- Board and administration needs to be fully engaged and unified in calling for a referendum and providing information to the community. It is not a task for one person.
- Review past election data to identify voters and number of votes.
- Staff must be fully informed of the building proposals. Encourage and celebrate staff voting so that they will encourage their networks to vote (neighbors, churches, etc.)

Appendix 1

Spartanburg County School District Three School Facility Needs Focus Groups Monday, November 12, 2018

Name the top strength of the district that comes to your mind.

- Overall size is good.
- Student/teacher ratio.
- All students have sports opportunities because of size.
- Every student is known.
- Values.
- Respect between parents and teachers.
- "this is a special place."
- Students really like the district (don't want to leave).
- Small class sizes.
- Unity.
- Good education.
- Friendly.

Name the top weakness of the district that comes to your mind.

- Tax base (low revenues).
- People holding on to land so it can't be developed.
- Limited business.
- Need technology updates.
- Age of buildings.
- Not enough exposure for students' opportunities, but not just about life exposure for students.
- Concerns about not keeping teachers – example was that for the foreign language offerings at the high school changes each year
- Small.
- Higher poverty level than surrounding districts/ areas.

For the past year, the district has been studying the condition and efficiency of its school buildings. The district has also been observing the growth and construction of new schools in some of the surrounding school districts. As a result of its findings, the district is studying a couple of proposals. Both proposals would result in the closing of two, 64-year-old middle schools. We would like your perception, thoughts on these ideas.

1. One proposal is to build one new, state-of-the-art, middle school that is centrally located within the district.

2. The second proposal is to build one state-of-the-art middle school AND make safety, classroom and technology renovations to all elementary schools and the high school.

Hearing the two proposals and without all of the fine details, in general...

Is there one proposal that you would strongly support and why?

- No one liked the middle school only proposal in one group.
- Several said they would support the second one depending on costs.
- They wanted real numbers. They didn't think the numbers they saw on a PowerPoint during a town hall added up.
- Mentioned that 20 years to pay off bond debt is a long time.
- If they did middle school now, would the district be asking for a high school soon after and request more money?
- A comment was made that only 12 new homes were built in the district last year, so there isn't really the need for more space.
- Like both proposals but torn about the ability of citizens to pay for the cost. But if had to choose, the middle school and renovations to other schools, is preferred because the payment for the entire package is not much higher than the middle school only proposal.
- Like new school but want it closer to the middle of the district.
- Promised Broome would be built centrally located (this was mentioned and discussed at several points during the discussion in both groups).

Is there another proposal that voters would more strongly support and why?

- Build a new high school instead. Make sure it is centrally located. Renovate existing high school for the combined middle school. Be sure to include safety for elementary schools.
- One attendee thought that a new high school would attract residential growth.
- Support just one middle school.
- Eliminate rivalries.
- Proposals not leaving behind.
- Update existing if we are losing students.
- Unique thing is small.
- Would like to see the breakdown of the renova-

tions to the middle schools and the cost of new high school.

- Need a clear plan for B.E. Mayes School if new middle school is built.
- Would support cost if renovate existing schools.
- Class sizes would remain small?
- Need to know what is going to happen to two middle schools.

Yes or no: I believe Spartanburg Three voters would overwhelmingly support a \$38 to \$40 million bond referendum to pay for the construction of a new middle school.

If you said no, why? If you said yes, why?

- No, people can't afford that increase on their taxes.
- Not overwhelmingly, it's going to be a fight.
- No, they will be afraid that once the district starts asking for money, they won't stop. (high school next).

Yes or no, I believe Spartanburg Three voters would overwhelming support a \$55 to \$58 million bond referendum to pay for the construction of a middle school and renovations to all elementary schools and high school.

If you said no, why? If you said yes, why?

- Yes, because every school will get something.
- Yes, because all schools would benefit.
- Yes, but will take work.
- No, people can't afford that increase on their taxes.
- Not overwhelmingly, but maybe.
- I would personally vote for it, but I don't think others would.
- Yes I think voters would support it if they have all of the information.

One proposed location for the new middle school is Clifdale Elementary (one of four elementary schools). Clifdale Elementary would be torn down and the new middle school built on that site.

Yes or no: would you and other voters support this location? Why or why not.

- It's not centrally located, just like the high school.
- The reason I moved here was to be able to walk my kids to school.
- This would make the entire thing fail.
- Long bus rides for students.
- By closing an elementary school, it would increase the class size of the other elementary schools.
- Would cause more wear/tear on the elementary schools with 300 more kids attending them.

- There has to be a better location.
- It's one of the newest schools in the district, why would you tear it down?
- This would push parents to another district.
- Why are you only telling us about one location and not all 8 tonight?

If no, what locations would you and other voters support?

- The location needs to be centrally located. We were told the high school would be and it isn't.

Other comments:

- The Converse Fire District just increased taxes, people aren't going to be happy about another tax increase.
- First bond referendum since the 50's.
- People want to know what would happen to existing middle schools. Could the district sell them make some money?
- There is a fear of Broome and Spartan High being consolidated.

Appendix 2

SCSBA Bond Referenda Detailed Report

(Attached)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
------	-----------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------------------	----------------------------

2018 *(Updated November 14, 2018)*

Won: One billion, one hundred seventy-eight million, seventy-six thousand (\$1,178,076,000) in 6 districts
Lost: 204 million (\$204,000,000) in 3 districts

11/06/18	Edgefield County School District	Safety upgrades and renovations at all schools and additions and expansions for and elementary, middle and technology center. New Construction at Strom Thurmond High School to include an auditorium, gymnasium and practice track	\$54.670		6,308 (71.33%)	2,535 (28.67%)
11/06/18	Lexington County School District One	Updated Safety and Security Systems at all District Schools and Facilities, three new schools and two new elementary schools, renovations, additions and/or other upgrades to 14 elementary schools, renovations and additions and/or other upgrades to five middle schools and five high schools, renovations, additions and/or other upgrades to two other schools and one building, a new District Transportation Facility and information technology equipment and miscellaneous furniture to create "Future Ready Classrooms" at all schools and to meet needs at other district facilities	\$365		26,702 (56.43%)	20,616 (43.5%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
11/06/18	Lexington County School District Three	Improvements at B-L Primary School and a newly constructed B-L High School, including a new athletic facility and providing enhanced safety and technology for students and staff		\$90	1,521 (37.85%)	2,498 (62.15%)
11/06/18	Marlboro County School District	Renovations and/or construction at all schools and certain other facilities in the school district including at Bennettsville Intermediate and school safety and security improvements	\$10		5,354 (70.33%)	2,259 (29.57%)
11/06/18	Richland Two Schools \$468,406,000 (total)	Question 1: Safety and security improvements across the district, a permanent facility for Center for Knowledge North and an addition at Blythewood High, new buses and safety/security improvements for all buses, new facilities for Bethel-Hanberry Elementary and Forest Lake Elementary, New facilities for E.L. Wright Middle and Center for Knowledge, technology upgrades across the district	\$381.952		31,152 (64.90%)	16,850 (35.10%)
		Question 2: Build a district fine/performing arts center, improve athletic facilities across the district including adding field houses to middle and high schools, upgrade Richland Northeast High and Ridge View High athletic facilities including expansions of football stadiums	\$86.454		30,900 (59.66%)	20,890 (40.34%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
05/01/18	Aiken County School District	Renovation and expansion of Midland Valley High School, renovation and expansion of Hammond Hill Elementary School, renovation and expansion of Belvedere Elementary, renovation and expansion at Millbrook Elementary and a new elementary school and middle school between Graniteville and North Augusta	\$90		8,740	7,420 (45.9%)
04/21/18	Beaufort County Schools	Classroom additions to existing facilities, constructing and equipping of new facilities including a new school in Bluffton and a new career and technical education building at Beaufort High School, Bluffton High School and Hilton Head Island High School		\$76	4,038	10,519
03/20/18	Fort Mill Schools	Build two Elementary Schools and one Middle School, technology devices and upgrades, HVAC replacement, Kitchen equipment replacement, land purchase for future school sites, purchase additional school buses	\$190		4,840 (71.03%)	(28.97%)
02/13/18	Chester County School District	Maintenance, renovation, and upgrades to each of the district's facilities and the new construction of a new Workforce Readiness Center		\$38	863 (46.57%)	993 (53.43%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2017						
Won:		0				
Lost:		188 million in 2 districts				
09/05/17	Laurens School District 55	New Laurens District High School, new gymnasium at Gray Court-Owings School and a new child development center		\$109		
05/03/17	Anderson School District 4	New middle school, athletic facility upgrades at PHS and improvements to roofs and HVAC systems at elementary schools.		\$79		
2016						
Won:		921.4 million in 8 districts				
Lost:		217 million in 1 district				
03/15/16	Spartanburg School District 7	Building a new high school and elementary school, renovations to current high school and renovating, improving and equipping other school facilities within the school district	\$185		4,530 (63%)	2,669 (37%)
3/22/2016	Lancaster County School	Variety of school district projects, including safety improvements, new multi-purpose buildings, renovation projects, athletic facilities upgrades and technology initiatives. Construction of a new elementary school and a high school to help ease overcrowding.	\$199		5,420 (74%)	1,885 (26%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
11/8/16	Bamberg 2	Construction and renovation costs for a new Pre-K-12 school facility comprised of a Pre-K-8 school and a high school, as well as sports fields and new school district administration and maintenance offices.	\$38		1,754 (75%)	592 (25%)
11/8/16	Beaufort County	Bond referendum Sales Tax Building additions and renovations at nine locations, HVAC upgrades, roof replacements, new construction and land acquisition <i>(1ct. sales tax over 10 years)</i>		\$217	32,409 (46%) 29,796 (41%)	38,650 (54%) 43,141 (59%)
11/8/16	Darlington	Building three new schools to replace six aging schools <i>(1 ct. sales tax over 15 years)</i>	\$60		15,434 (62%)	9,372 (38%)
11/8/16	Georgetown County	Constructing, improving, equipping, expanding, renovating or repairing district facilities and improving technology	\$165		22,667 (78%)	6,294 (22%)
11/8/16	Kershaw	Bond Referendum Sales Tax New facilities, improvements, additions and renovations to existing facilities and improvements and renovations to athletic facilities <i>(1 ct. sales tax over 15 years)</i>	\$129		18,565 (67%) 17,874 (64)	9,194 (33%) 10,023 (36%)
11/8/16	Lexington Four	Renovations and improvements to athletic complex, construction of a performing arts center, expansion of high school CATE courses and renovations and construction to address safety issues.	\$25.4		3,237 (63%)	1,881 (37%)
11/8/16	Spartanburg 2	Constructing and equipping a new high school, renovating the current high school and upgrades to existing athletic facilities.	\$120		17,951 (79%)	4,638 (21%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2015						
Won:		\$336 in 2 districts				
Lost:		None				
05/05/15	Fort Mill School District	Building new high school, middle school, aquatic center, training facility; purchasing land for future schools; purchasing new buses; technology upgrades	\$226		3,258 (60%)	2,187 (40%)
05/05/15	Rock Hill School District	Expansion/renovation of schools, purchasing activity buses, technology upgrades, security upgrades	\$110		4,532 (88%)	603 (12%)
2014						
Won:		Est. \$1 billion, 335 million in 10 districts				
Lost:		\$201 million in 2 districts				
11/4/2014	Aiken County	Building new middle school, upgrades to schools	\$188		23,909 (59%)	16,407 (41%)
11/4/2014	Anderson School Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	10% of proceeds to reduce debt service millage, building new career center, upgrades to schools	\$205.5		23,024 (53%)	20,645 (47%)
11/4/2014	Charleston County	Building new schools, upgrades to schools	\$540-\$640		63,166 (67%)	30,846 (33%)
11/4/2014	Dorchester Four	Building renovations, upgrades	\$10		3,220 (71%)	1,299 (29%)
11/4/2014	Kershaw County	Building four schools, upgrades to other schools		\$130	9,227 (49%)	9,441 (51%)
11/4/2014	Lexington Two	Building performing arts center, two schools and upgrades	\$225		10,025 (65%)	5,337 (35%)
09/9/2014	Spartanburg Five	Upgrade high school, stadium		\$71	2,188 (38%)	3,638 (62%)
03/22/14	Clover	Building two new schools, upgrade one school, aquatic center	\$67		3,650 (65%)	1,984 (35%)



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2013						
Won:		\$54.3 in 1 district				
Lost:		None				
04/30/13	Fort Mill School District	Building – new schools, upgrade security, technology	\$54.3		3,229	698
2012						
Won:		\$397.9 in 3 districts				
Lost:		\$0 in 0 districts				
11/13/2012	Berkeley	Building – 5 new schools Upgrade – 20 schools	\$198		40,092	27,042
11/13/2012	Dorchester Two	Building – 4 new schools Upgrades – 10 schools	\$179.9		27,184	18,229
11/13/2012	Dorchester Two	Acquatic Center	\$7.5		23,161	22,252
11/13/2012	Marlboro	Building – 1 new school	\$20			
2011						
Won:		None				
Lost:		None				
2010						
Won:		\$499 in 5 districts				
Lost:		\$236 in 1 district				
3/17/2010	Bamberg One	Building – 1 new school	\$29		826	797
5/25/2010	Aiken County	Building		\$236	5,744	13,716
6/08/2010	Hampton One	Building – 1 new school	\$14		2,065	1,010



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
11/2/2010	Hampton Two	Building - 1 new school	\$6		1,380	523
11/2/2010	Charleston	Building - Upgrades (1ct. sales tax over 6 years)	\$450		53,784	30,939

2009

Won: None
Lost: None

2008

Won: \$1 billion, 326.15 in 9 districts
Lost: \$36 in 2 districts

3/4/2008	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building - 2 new schools	\$87.25		4,155	960
	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building-Gym/stadium upgrade	\$8.7		3,880	1,228
3/18/2008	Anderson One	Building	\$85.7		2,637	980
4/26/2008	Beaufort	Building	\$162.7		5,222	4,800
5/17/2008	Allendale	Building		\$22.5	148	862
11/4/2008	Lexington/Richland Five	Building	\$244		26,195	20,932
	Lexington One	Building	\$336		26,165	18,328
	Richland Two	Building	\$306		34,167	16,564
	Marlboro	Building	\$18		6,235	3,424
	Greenwood 52	Building	\$29		2,489	969
	Horry County	Building	\$48.8		64,946	31,906
	Williston (Barnwell 29)	Building		\$13.5	867	1,236



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2007						
Won:		\$304.8 in 4 districts				
Lost:		\$520.1 in 5 districts				
12/4	Dillon One, Two and Three	Building	\$60		2,155	1,045
11/6	Florence One	Building		\$125	2,981	3,149
11/6	Lexington Four	Building	\$19.8			
11/6	Lexington/Richland Five	Building			\$256.5	
10/9	Hampton One	Building		\$30	1,246	2,754
9/18	Bamberg One	Building		\$73.6		
5/16	York One	Building	\$85	1,947		1,232
4/24	Anderson Five	Building	\$140	2,180		1,416
3/7	Greenwood 52	Building		\$35		
2006						
Won:		\$ 112.7 in 3 districts				
Lost:		\$ 66 in 1 district				
9/16	Clover Two (York Two)	Building	\$58.5			
5/20	Beaufort	Building	\$43.7		6,535	4,231
3/7	Marlboro	Building		\$66		
2/28	Anderson Three	Building	\$10.5			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2005						
Won: \$166.8 in 3 districts						
Lost: \$131.4 in 1 district						
11/8	Lexington/Richland Five	Building		\$131.4		
10/18	Anderson Four	Building	\$26.8			
8/2	Laurens District 56	Building	\$48			
4/2	Rock Hill Three (York Three)	Building	\$92			
2004						
Won: \$596.05 in 4 districts						
Lost: \$5.2 in 1 district						
11/2	Horry	Building	\$240		37,860	31,354
11/2	Lexington One	Building	\$118			
11/2	Richland Two	Building	\$175.5		29,511	11,404
6/8	Clarendon One	Building		\$5.2		
3/16	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building	\$62.55			
2003						
Won: \$48 in 1 district						
Lost: \$167.6 in 2 districts						
11/5	Darlington	Building	\$48			
9/23	York One	Building		\$69.3		
3/25	Dorchester Two	Building		\$98.3		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
2002						
Won:		\$510.7 in 4 districts				
Lost:		1 district				
11/5	Richland One	Building	\$381			
11/5	Spartanburg One	Building	\$67			
5/11	McCormick	Building	\$12.7			
5/7	Lexington Two	Building	\$50			
2001						
Won:		\$47.5 in 2 districts				
Lost:		\$62 in 1 district				
9/9	Jasper	Building	\$45.97			
3/3	Spartanburg One	Building		\$62		
2/24	Marion Three	Building	\$1.5			
2000						
Won:		\$453.6 in 9 districts				
Lost:		\$158.3 in 4 districts				
11/9	Richland Two	Building	\$98.3			
11/9	Abbeville	Building	\$8.5			
9/9	Orangeburg Cons.Three	Building	\$40			
6/24	Abbeville	Building		\$8		
5/27	Chesterfield	Building	\$60			
5/6	Orangeburg Cons.Three	Building		\$40		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
5/6	Darlington	Building		\$99.9		
4/29	Anderson Three	Building	\$10.3			
3/28	Kershaw	Building	\$25			
3/22	Rock Hill	Building	\$80			
3/18	Beaufort	Building	\$120			
3/4	Spartanburg Five	Building	\$11.5			
2/26	McCormick	Building	\$10.4			

1999

Won: \$568.3 in 9 districts
Lost: \$81.6 in 2 districts

12/4	Colleton	Building		\$39.5		
12/4	Anderson Two	Building	\$29.9			
11/2	Horry	Building	\$150			
10/12	Orangeburg Cons. Five	Building	\$48			
6/1	Lancaster	Building	\$36.5			
5/22	Berkeley	Building	\$192			
5/18	Laurens 55	Building	\$24			
5/18	York Four	Building	\$48.3			
4/11	Richland Two	Building		\$42.1		
3/6	Lexington Four	Building	\$20			
3/6	Anderson One	Building	\$19.6			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1998						
Won: \$258.2 in 4 districts						
Lost: \$720.3 in 11 districts						
11/3	Charleston	Building	\$175			
11/3	Anderson Three	Building		\$21.9		
11/3	Orangeburg Cons. Five	Building		\$48		
10/13	Orangeburg Cons. Four	Building	\$18			
9/19	Union	Building		\$48		
9/15	Laurens 55	Building		\$48		
9/15	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building		\$64.7		
8/98	Colleton	Building		\$49.2		
5/98	Abbeville	Building		\$25.5		
5/98	Florence Three	Building		\$15		
4/98	Clarendon Three	Building	\$5.2			
3/98	Charleston	Building		\$350		
3/98	Laurens 55	Building		\$ 50		
3/98	Spartanburg Seven	Building	\$60			
1997						
Won: \$ 320.3 in 13 districts						
Lost: \$ 107 in 1 district						
10/97	Clarendon Two	Building	\$9.7			
9/97	Blackville-Hilda (Barnwell 19)	Building	\$10			
9/97	Georgetown	Building	\$109.6			
9/97	Saluda	Building	\$18.5			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
9/97	Marlboro	Building	\$6			
9/97	Clover Two (York Two)	Building	\$32.8			
5/97	Lee	Building	\$16.5			
5/97	Florence Two	Building	\$8			
5/97	Orangeburg Six	Building	\$12.5			
5/97	Georgetown	Building		\$107		
5/97	Florence Four	Building	\$12.8			
5/97	Lexington One	Building	\$61			
3/97	Orangeburg Two	Building	\$10			
3/97	Lexington Three	Building	\$12.9			

1996

Won: \$401.7 in 11 districts
Lost: None

10/96	Orangeburg Eight	Building	\$8.4			
9/96	Sumter 17	Building	\$24.3			
9/96	Dorchester Four	Building	\$15			
9/96	Richland One	Building	\$184			
9/96	Richland Two	Building	\$19.7			
5/96	Chester	Building	\$19			
5/96	Lexington/Richland Five	Building	\$29.3			
5/96	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building	\$24.5			
5/96	Lexington Two	Building	\$19			
4/96	York One	Building	\$18.5			
2/96	Rock Hill Three (York Three)	Building	\$40			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1995						
Won:		\$176.3 in 4 districts				
Lost:		\$178.5 in 3 districts				
12/95	Lexington/Richland Five	Building		\$48		
10/95	Florence Five	Building	\$6			
9/95	Dorchester Two	Building	\$25.5			
5/95	Beaufort	Building	\$122			
5/95	Saluda	Building		\$22.5		
5/95	Georgetown	Building		\$108		
3/95	Anderson Four	Building	\$22.8			
1994						
Won:		\$119.7 in 5 districts				
Lost:		\$116.5 in 3 districts				
11/94	Horry	Building	\$60			
9/94	Orangeburg Three	Building	\$5.6			
8/94	Cherokee	Building	\$47			
5/94	Beaufort	Building		\$80.9		
4/94	Anderson One	Building		\$23.8		
3/94	Dorchester Four	Building		\$11.8		
3/94	Lexington Three	Building	\$5.5			
3/94	Marion Four	Building	\$1.6			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1993						
Won: \$124.5 in 7 districts						
Lost: \$ 70 in 5 districts						
11/93	Dorchester Two	Building		\$22.2		
11/93	Orangeburg One	Building	\$9.8			
9/93	Sumter Two	Building	\$28.5			
9/93	Sumter Two	Stadium		\$1		
9/93	Orangeburg Four	Building	\$7.4			
9/93	Oconee	Building	\$21.8			
5/93	Abbeville	Building	\$10			
5/93	Pickens	Building	\$30			
5/93	Lexington Four	Building		\$6		
5/93	Oconee	Building		\$31.8		
4/93	Williamsburg	Building		\$9		
3/93	Richland Two	Building	\$17			
1992						
Won: \$50.2 in 7 districts						
Lost: \$58.7 in 4 districts (one twice)						
11/92	Dorchester Four	Building		\$10		
11/92	Hampton Two	Building	\$2.3			
11/92	Williston 29 (Barnwell 29)	Building	\$2.6			
9/92	Marion One	Building	\$6			
9/92	Florence One	Building	\$13.4			
9/92	Newberry	Building		\$15		
8/92	Hampton Two	Building		\$2.5		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
5/92	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building	\$10.1			
5/92	Bamberg Two	Building	\$4.8			
5/92	Clarendon One	Building	\$11			
3/92	Greenwood 50	Building		\$4.9		
2/92	Newberry	Building		\$26.3		

1991

Won: \$94.6 in 4 districts
Lost: \$23.9 in 2 districts

12/91	Edgefield	Building	\$20.6			
10/91	Union	Building		\$7.9		
10/91	Clover Two (York Two)	Building	\$21.635			
10/91	Lancaster	Building	\$29.850			
9/91	Chester	Building	\$22.5			
5/91	Abbeville	Building		\$16		

1990

Won: \$20.7 in 2 districts
Lost: \$145.8 in 7 districts

11/90	Florence Four	Building		\$4		
8/90	Hampton Two	Building		\$1.8		
7/90	Florence Four	Building		\$4		
5/90	Edgefield	Building		\$16.5		
3/90	Berkeley	Building		\$70		
3/90	Florence Three	Building		\$3.5		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
3/90	Ware Shoals (Greenwood 51)	Building	\$1			
2/90	Kershaw	Building	\$19.65			
2/90	Richland Two	Building		\$46		
1989						
Won:		\$87 in 6 districts				
Lost:		\$54.3 in 3 districts				
11/89	Chester	Building		\$41		
10/89	York One	Building	\$7.75			
9/89	Anderson Five	Building	\$26			
5/89	Dorchester Two	Building	\$28			
5/89	Anderson One	Building	\$7.9			
3/89	Barnwell 45	Building	\$11.5			
3/89	Denmark-Olar (Bamberg Two)	Building		\$7		
3/89	Saluda	Building		\$6.25		
3/89	Sumter 17	Building	\$5.9			
1988						
Won:		\$104 in 3 districts				
Lost:		\$39.2 in 3 districts				
11/88	Calhoun	Building		\$3.5		
6/88	Beaufort	Building	\$45			
5/88	Rock Hill Three (York Three)	Building	\$31			
3/88	Kershaw	Building		\$27.5		
3/88	Marion Two	Building		\$8.2		
3/88	Lexington/Richland Five	Building	\$28			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1987						
Won:		\$21 in 2 districts				
Lost:		\$56.3 in 5 districts				
11/87	Florence Three	Building		\$5.8		
11/87	Spartanburg Two	Building		\$12		
11/87	Richland Two	Building	\$17			
11/87	Spartanburg Four	Building	\$4			
9/87	Lexington One	Building		\$12.5		
9/87	Sumter Two	Building		\$13.5		
5/87	Lexington One	Building		\$12.5		
1986						
Won:		\$65.7 in 5 districts				
Lost:		\$118.7 in 4 districts				
11/86	Marlboro	Building	\$9			
11/86	Hampton One	Building	\$5			
11/86	Horry	Building	\$36			
3/86	Dorchester Two	Building	\$10			
3/86	Bamberg One	Building	\$5.7			
3/86	Denmark-Olar (Bamberg Two)	Building		\$2.7		
3/86	Dorchester Two	Building		\$28		
3/86	Lexington One	Building		\$28		
3/86	Horry	Building		\$60		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1985						
Won: \$47.2 in 6 districts						
Lost: None						
	Allendale	Building	\$6.5			
	Jasper	Building	\$7.8			
	Orangeburg Two	Building	\$1.6			
	Sumter 17	Building	\$10.76			
	York One	Building	\$6.5			
	Rock Hill Three (York Three)	Building	\$14			
1984						
Won: \$14.3 in 3 districts						
Lost: \$10.5 in 1 districts						
	Laurens 56	Building	\$5			
	Orangeburg Four	Building	\$5.5			
	Orangeburg Seven	Building	\$3.75			
	Oconee	Building		\$10.5		
1983						
Won: \$11.4 in 1 district						
Lost: None						
	Fort Mill (York Four)	Building	\$11.4			



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON (millions)	LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1982	Won: \$39.8 in 3 districts					
	Lost: \$10 in 1 district					
	Jasper	Building		\$10		
	Fairfield	Building	\$15			
	Georgetown	Building	\$23.5			
	Hampton Two	Building	\$1.25			
1981	Won: \$9.2 in 2 districts					
	Lost: \$15.5 in 2 districts					
	Unknown*	Building	\$8			
	Florence Five	Building	\$1.2			
	Jasper	Building		\$13		
	Oconee	Building		\$2.5		
<i>*District name not given in response to 1986 SCSBA survey on referenda campaigns.</i>						
1980	Won: \$6.7 in 2 districts					
	Lost: \$7.5 in 1 district					
	Clarendon Two	Building	\$5.2			
	Union	Building	\$1.5			
	Marlboro	Building		\$7.5		



bond referendum detailed report

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	\$ WON (millions)	\$ LOST (millions)	Number of VOTES FOR	Number of VOTES AGAINST
1979						
Won:		None				
Lost:		\$55.2 in 2 districts				
	Clarendon Two	Building		\$5.2		
	Georgetown	Building		\$50		
1978						
Won:		\$16.6 in 3 districts				
Lost:		\$10 in 1 district				
	Anderson Four	Building	\$5			
	Calhoun	Building	\$4.75			
	Greenwood 50	Building	\$6.8			
	Orangeburg Five	Building		\$10		



bond referendum detailed report

Other referenda in South Carolina

Date	School District	Purpose of Referendum	WON	LOST
5/03	Florence One	Increase oper. millage	32 mills	
8/02	Florence One	Limited fiscal autonomy		Limited fiscal autonomy
5/01	Greenville	Increase oper. millage		9.9 mills
5/01	Florence One	Increase oper. millage	8 mills	
5/99	Florence One	Increase oper. millage	x	
4/99	Marion	Consolidate		x
11/98	Florence One	Fiscal Independence		Fiscal Independence
11/92	Darlington	Reduce bd size	x	
	Charleston	Go to SM bd seats		x
3/90	Union (Lockhart, Jonesville)(non-binding referendum)	To form own district	x	
11/88	Oconee	Appt. superintendent		x
5/88	Florence One	Current oper. millage	17 mills	
11/87	Beaufort	Fiscal independence		x
11/87	Colleton	Appoint. superintendent		x
10/87	Lancaster	Appoint. superintendent	x	
11/86	Beaufort	Non-partisan election for school board	x	
3/86	Florence One	Increase oper. millage		x