



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

Report on Disadvantaged Student
Supplemental Funding (DSSF)

SL 2005-276, Sec. 7.8

(SB 622, the 2005 Budget Bill)

Date Due: February 15, 2006
Report #26
DPI Chronological Schedule, 2005-2006

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

HOWARD N. LEE
Chairman :: Raleigh

SHIRLEY E. HARRIS
Troy

JOHN TATE III
Charlotte

JANE P. NORWOOD
Vice Chair :: Charlotte

MELISSA E. BARTLETT
 Mooresville

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY
Raleigh

KATHY A. TAFT
Greenville

ROBERT "TOM" SPEED
Boone

BEVERLY PERDUE
Lieutenant Governor :: New Bern

MICHELLE HOWARD-VITAL
Wilmington

WAYNE MCDEVITT
Asheville

RICHARD MOORE
State Treasurer :: Kittrell

EDGAR D. MURPHY
Durham

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent

301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Dr. Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent :: Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services
6307 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6307 :: Telephone 919-807-3761 :: Fax 919-807-3767

Visit us on the Web:: www.ncpublicschools.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Study Goals and Objectives	2
Problem and Approach	2
Study Team	5
Developments to Date and Current Funding Status.....	7
Tasks Accomplished to Date	9
Timeline and Deliverables for 2006.....	10
Action Plan Format	12
Budget Plan Format	13
Budget Amendment Form.....	14
Enabling Legislation	15

Executive Summary

In late fall of 2003 and early 2004, sixteen districts targeted to receive Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding (DSSF) began a two-year pilot program. Funds in the amount of \$22,000, 000 were set aside to support this effort. The overall goal is to promote the leveraging of funds from all sources (federal, state and local) to create and support conditions that have a positive long-term impact on student academic performance. These include, but are not limited to: (a) recruiting and retaining quality teachers, (b) reducing class size, (c) extending instructional time (d) providing quality professional development, and (e) purchasing of materials and equipment that align with and support the instructional delivery process. The designated districts must annually complete and submit an action plan and a supporting budget plan to the State Board of Education for approval. A budget amendment may be submitted for approval if found to be necessary and is agreed upon by the LEA and the LEA Assistance Team members.

Early plans called for the evaluation of the outcomes achieved through this two-year pilot and evaluation on an ongoing basis if funding is available. Dr. Charles L. Thompson, Department of Education Leadership, East Carolina University was contracted to be the leader of the group that would be assembled to conduct the evaluation. The body of this report was prepared by Dr. Thompson and Dr. Gary T. Henry, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University. (A complete Curriculum Vita for Dr. Henry is on file and can be reviewed upon request.) This report will reflect the activities that he and his team have been engaged in up to this point and project future work and activities. The program really began mid-year in 2004 so an evaluation has not be completed at this time; however the desk top gathering of data is proceeding and onsite face-to-face data-gathering from local personnel is beginning.

Another component of this program is to provide support, guidance and assistance to the districts receiving the additional funding through the assignment of LEA Assistance Team members to work with each of the Local Teams which include the Superintendent, Leader of the instruction, the finance officer, the personnel director and the test coordinator along with a principals representative from each organizational level. The two groups come together for quarterly for professional development, sharing sessions, to receive informational updates and to network across districts. The sixteen systems receiving additional funding and are included in the evaluation are:

1. Edgecombe County
2. Franklin County
3. Halifax County
4. Hertford County
5. Hoke County
6. Hyde County
7. Lexington City Schools
8. Montgomery County
9. Northampton County
10. Elizabeth City/Pasquotank.
11. Robeson County
12. Thomasville City Schools
13. Vance County
14. Warren County
15. Washington
16. Weldon City Schools

Study Goals and Questions

The goals and guiding questions for the evaluation derive from the goals of the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund (DSSF), itself. The overarching goal of DSSF is to increase learning and academic achievement by disadvantaged students in the 16 pilot districts. Toward this end, DSSF seeks to help participating districts attract and retain qualified teachers, ensure effective principals, and provide improved, individualized instruction to students at risk of failure in school. The program makes significant new funds available for districts to pursue improvement strategies chosen from a “menu of options,” including:

- bonuses to retain and professional development to strengthen current teachers;
- bonuses and recruiting expenses to attract new teachers;
- more individualized and supplemental instruction for disadvantaged students;
- software that allows teachers to monitor student achievement progress throughout the school year; and
- instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.

The program also provides technical assistance in choosing, designing, and implementing appropriate strategies through the Department of Public Instruction’s Local Education Agency Assistance Program (LEAAP).

Thus, the goal of the evaluation is to help improve the effectiveness of the DSSF program by providing trustworthy evidence about (1) the impact of the program on student outcomes and on the enabling goals concerning teachers, principals, and instruction, (2) the effectiveness of the strategies supported by the program as they are implemented in pilot districts, and (3) the efficacy of the help provided to participating districts by the DPI’s Local Education Agency Assistance Program.

The corresponding questions are these:

1. Overall Outcomes: Does DSSF improve learning for disadvantaged students, teacher recruitment and retention, principal effectiveness, and instruction for at-risk students?
2. Strategies: Which strategies improve outcomes and how? Which strategies are less effective? Are there other strategies that should be included in the menu available for adoption by participating districts?
3. LEAAP Assistance: What types of assistance are the LEAAP providing to districts, which are most effective, and how might assistance be improved?

Problem and Approach

The central problem for the evaluation is this: the DSSF program supports several different strategies, many of which may have already been in use to some degree, not only in the DSSF districts but also in other districts across the state. In addition, in both DSSF and non-DSSF districts, many other policies or “strategies” are at work, both general policy instruments (such as the ABCs accountability system and the accountability provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act) and a variety of specific activities designed to improve the quality of instruction or to extend instructional.

Thus, an evaluation that would simply describe the DSSF strategies in use on the one hand and examine changes in outcomes on the other hand could not reliably determine the extent to which DSSF is responsible for any changes in outcomes that may be observed. The multiplicity of strategies, the possibility that strategies supported by DSSF were already in use in DSSF districts before the program began, and the possibility that non-DSSF districts are implementing the same strategies implemented by DSSF districts, and possible interactions among strategies would so complicate the picture that a simple evaluation could produce misleading results, results that would be neither fair to the participating districts nor useful as a source of reliable guidance for district administrators and state policy makers.

What is needed is an evaluation that can both sort out the contribution of DSSF from other changes going on in local districts across North Carolina and provide information on the extent to which specific DSSF strategies improve outcomes for disadvantaged students. This requires a developing a technically sophisticated evaluation design, assembling a massive amount of existing data, collecting additional data, and using state-of-the-art analytical procedures.

After extended discussions and exploration of possible evaluation approaches, we concluded that an approach called “Program Theory Evaluation” could produce results sufficiently fine-grained and reliable to offer the guidance requested by the General Assembly and needed by state and local policy makers. By capitalizing on the wealth of data that exists concerning North Carolina schools but which has not been assembled and analyzed for evaluation and accountability purposes, the evaluation will provide solid evidence not only about the DSSF in particular but also more broadly on the use of resources to improve student learning.

The approach will trace the implementation of DSSF strategies in local districts from the arrival of funds through changes in expenditure patterns (including but not limited to DSSF funds) and their impact on disadvantaged students’ opportunities to learn via (1) improvements in the qualifications and experience levels of principals and teachers recruited and retained by the districts, (2) improvements in the instructional leadership provided by principals, (3) changes in teachers’ instructional practices, including what is taught and how it is taught, (4) changes in the size and composition of classes (grouping and tracking), (5) programs that extend the time and effort devoted to the education of disadvantaged children (tutoring, academic after school programs, Saturday academies, summer programs), and (6) other changes effected by DSSF that actually shape the amount and quality of disadvantaged students’ opportunities to learn. Analyses will then explore connections between these types of changes and corresponding changes in student outcomes.

To sort out the changes attributable to DSSF funds and activities from those attributable to other factors, the evaluation will make several types of comparisons. Analyses will compare changes in expenditure patterns, opportunities to learn, and student outcomes within DSSF districts from year to year. These analyses will provide us with measures of progress in DSSF districts. The evaluation will also compare changes in DSSF districts in these regards with the same types of changes in other North Carolina districts. These comparisons should help us isolate which

improvements may be attributable to DSSF and which improvements may reflect general trends shaped by other state, federal, or locally-initiated policies and programs.

By tracking the impact of DSSF through the processes outlined above, the evaluation will also seek to identify promising changes in what may be thought of as “leading indicators” of gains in student achievement and attainment – variables that should eventually produce improvements in student outcomes even though the improvements are not yet measurable. Some forty years of federal, state, and local efforts to improve the education of disadvantaged students have shown that it takes time and persistence to achieve real improvements in outcomes. But policy makers need interim indicators of whether a program seems to be headed in a constructive direction, whether significant outcomes improvements may be expected over the longer term, and what types of adjustments in the program might bring about better outcomes. By identifying and measuring “leading indicator” variables, the proposed evaluation will be able to provide useful information sooner than could a simple outcome-oriented evaluation.

In order to conduct the analyses necessary to isolate improvements attributable to DSSF and to provide guidance about which strategies are making what types of contributions, several broad types of data must be assembled or collected:

1. Data on DSSF districts’ choice of strategies, the implementation of these strategies, and the influence of LEEAP assistance on both the choice and implementation of strategies;
2. Data on districts’ expenditure patterns before and after the onset of DSSF, including but not limited to DSSF funds, and not only for DSSF districts but for districts statewide;
3. Data on principals’ and teachers’ qualifications and experience, both in DSSF districts and in districts statewide;
4. Data on principals’ instructional leadership behaviors and teachers’ instructional practices;
5. Data on changes in the size and composition of classes as well as on programs to extend instructional time, in DSSF districts and, to the extent feasible, statewide; and
6. Data on other changes in DSSF districts that may affect student outcomes, such as the use of student achievement monitoring software, uncovered by tracking DSSF implementation.

Obviously, assembling or collecting data of this scope, often on a statewide scale, will require a large data collection and management team with a variety of types of expertise and capacity. Conducting the subsequent data management and data analysis tasks will also make major expertise and capacity demands. Up to this point, we have had funding solely to support development of a detailed design. Funds have not yet been provided to actually carry out the evaluation. But in anticipation of the funding to implement the design we have developed, we have assembled the study team described below. The history of our work on the evaluation is then outlined, followed by a description of tasks accomplished to date and a timeline and set of deliverables for 2006.

Study Team

A first major task in detailing the evaluation design and preparing to implement it has been to assemble a team with the required mix of qualifications and skills. The qualifications and responsibilities of the team are described briefly below:

Principal Investigator: Gary T. Henry

Qualifications: Gary T. Henry is Professor of Policy Studies in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University and Professor of Public Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology. He holds a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin. He previously served as the Director of Evaluation and Learning Services for the David and Lucile Packard Foundation; Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction for Policy, Assessment, Evaluation, Research, and Information Systems in the Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia; Deputy Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia; and Visiting Professor at the University of Liege (Belgium) and at Huang He University (People's Republic of China). Henry has evaluated a variety of policies and programs, including Pre-K and the HOPE Scholarship in Georgia. He is a member of several Scientific Peer Review Committees at the Institute for Education Sciences, US Department of Education as well as numerous advisory committees and editorial boards in the field of educational evaluation. Henry has also published extensively in the fields of evaluation and policy analysis.

A complete Curriculum Vitae for Dr. Henry is on file with the Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services.

Duties: Henry will provide overall direction for the evaluation project, including development of the design, data analysis, report writing, briefing key policy makers, and coordination of all components of the evaluation.

Co-Principal Investigator: Charles L. Thompson

Qualifications: Charles Thompson is Lora Wilson King Distinguished Professor in Education at East Carolina University. He holds a BA from UNC-Chapel Hill and a Master's and Ed. D. from the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Earlier in his career, Thompson co-directed the Educational Technology Center, a research center at Harvard; served as Associate Dean and Associate Professor at Michigan State University's College of Education; and directed the NC Education Research Council, a policy research unit of the North Carolina Education Cabinet. He has served as principal investigator or co-principal investigator for several projects funded by the National Science Foundation, the US Department of Education, and various private foundations.

Duties: Thompson will assist Henry in providing overall direction for the evaluation project and will participate in the collection of data on DSSF implementation, as well as in the analysis and reporting of data.

Project Manager for Georgia State University: Dana Rickman

Qualifications: Dana Rickman is a Senior Research Associate at the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Office of Domestic Programs, at Georgia State University. She holds a Master's and Ph.D. in Political Science, with a concentration in public administration and policy, from Georgia State University. Rickman has served as Principal Investigator and Project Manager for evaluation studies in educational settings for over seven years.

Duties: Rickman will oversee data collection, including providing training for research team members, and will coordinate securing of data from NC Department of Public Instruction as well as data management and analysis.

Coordinator of Survey Instrument Development and Administration: Bethany Page

Qualifications: Bethany Page is a founding member of Compass Consulting Group, Chapel Hill, NC. Her work includes designing and managing multiple large scale projects meeting the evaluation and research needs of private, public, and non-profit organizations. Previously Page served as Associate Director for Evaluation Services for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She holds a BS in Psychology, a M.Ed. in Educational Research Methodology, and a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology, Measurement, & Evaluation from the University of North Carolina.

Duties: Page will be responsible for oversight of design and administration of principal and teacher surveys employed in the evaluation.

Coordinator of Qualitative Data Collection: Wanda Weaver

Qualifications: Wanda Weaver is a Research Associate at Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her responsibilities have included coordinating large-scale, multi-site, longitudinal studies, serving as trainer and resource for data collection teams, and collaborating with state departments of education.

Duties: Weaver will coordinate arrangements for the collection of data on the implementation of DSSF plans and on LEAAP assistance. She will also assist in the design of qualitative data collection protocols and strategies and help provide training in their use.

Expert Panel Members

Dr. Beth Glennie, NC Education Data Center
Dr. Margaret Goertz, University of Pennsylvania
Dr. Gary Henry, Georgia State University
Dr. Helen Ladd, Sanford Institute, Duke University
Dr. Gary Williamson, MetaMetrics, Inc.
Dr. Rebecca Zulli, NC Education Research Council

Other Evaluation Team Members

Dr. Anne F. D'Agostino, Compass Consulting Group
Dr. Barry Aycock, Adjunct Professor of Education Leadership, East Carolina University;
formerly Superintendent of Lee County Schools
Elizabeth K. Cunningham, LLD, Independent Consultant, former Research Associate,
NC Education Research Council
Dr. Nancy B. Davis, Director, Rural Education Institute, East Carolina University;
formerly Executive Director, Smart Start of Mecklenburg County; Superintendent, Union
County Schools; and Executive Director, NC Department of Public Instruction
Dr. Beverly Faircloth, Assistant Professor of Education Leadership, East Carolina
University
C. Kevin Fortner, Doctoral Candidate and Graduate Assistant, Andrew Young School of
Public Policy, Georgia State University, experienced quantitative data manager and data
analyst
Dr. Amy Germuth, Partner in Compass Consulting Group and experienced program
evaluator
Dr. Sarah Heinemeier, Compass Consulting Group

Curriculum Vitae available for all team members upon request.

Developments to Date and Current Funding Status

During the Spring of 2005, the Governor's Education Advisor asked Professor Charles L. Thompson of East Carolina University's Department of Education Leadership to help think through an appropriate approach to evaluating the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund and to help identify an appropriate performer to carry out the work. Thompson agreed, and initial funds to assemble an Expert Panel to advise on this task were provided by the NC Education Research Council.

During the late Spring and early summer – before the General Assembly had appropriated funds for the DSSF program or an evaluation of it -- Thompson organized the panel, clarified the methodological challenges which an effective approach would have to address, and settled upon an approach to recommend. Thompson briefed the Governor's Education Advisor and

representatives from the Department of Public Instruction on the recommended approach. He noted that he had neither the necessary expertise nor the organizational capacity to actually conduct the evaluation himself but introduced Dr. Gary Henry of Georgia State University, a leading national expert in evaluation, and indicated that Dr. Henry does have the necessary expertise and would be prepared to join him to develop a detailed design employing the recommended approach.

Governor's Education Advisor JB Buxton and DPI officials Janice Davis, Philip Price, and Jane Worsham were persuaded that the recommended approach seemed promising and worth spelling out in greater detail. Thompson and Henry pointed out that the recommended approach would be ambitious and would cost on the order of \$500,000 per year to carry out. Buxton and Price recognized that the approach would not be inexpensive. Their own cost estimates had been similar or higher. At that time, no funds had yet been appropriated for the evaluation, but a budget request sufficient to cover the anticipated costs had been submitted to the General Assembly. Buxton and Price could not promise that the requested funds would be available, but believed that it was worth proceeding on the assumption that adequate funds would be available to pursue the recommended approach.

With the concurrence of Buxton and DPI officials, Thompson, Henry, and their colleagues began to work out the design and to prepare to carry it out, using Research Council funds. Later in the summer, the General Assembly appropriated \$150,000 for the evaluation – less than the Governor's request, but the best that could be managed in continuing tight budget times. Buxton and Price began to search for additional funds to supplement the appropriation and make it possible to carry out the recommended evaluation approach. They indicated that Thompson and Henry should proceed to develop a full plan on the assumption that adequate funds could be identified to support its implementation.

Over the course of the Fall and early Winter, Henry and his team in collaboration with Thompson have:

- Developed the more detailed evaluation plan;
- Assembled much of the existing quantitative data necessary to carry out the plan;
- Specified the analyses to be run on the data;
- Developed interview protocols for the analysis of DSSF district implementation strategies;
- Recruited and trained a team of interviewers to collect implementation data from all 16 DSSF counties;
- Completed reviews of research related to the 'menu of options';
- Identified survey instruments to be adopted or adapted for use in developing the pilot surveys for principals and teachers;
- Lined up two subcontract partners in North Carolina; and,
- Developed scopes of work and budgets for the full evaluation.

Henry and Thompson have detailed the recommended evaluation plans and made ready to carry them out once funds are made available. In anticipation of those funds, they have proceeded with

the longer term goal of building the capacity within North Carolina to conduct not only the ongoing evaluation of the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund but also other studies designed to inform education policy in the state.

Tasks Accomplished to Date

Assembled Expert Panel to advice on choice of approach, recommended approach, briefed Governor's Education Advisor and Key DPI Officials, identified and recruited appropriate Principal Investigator, initiated and participated in detailed planning (Thompson)

Conducted preliminary interviews with Dr. Elsie Leak, selected members of LEA Assistance Teams, and representatives of funded districts to clarify background on program and main foci for the evaluation (Thompson)

Presented overview of the DSSF pilot evaluation approach to the North Carolina State Board of Education

Developed detailed evaluation design and prepared to implement it, including the following steps:

- Identified existing data on student performance, budgets and expenditures, principal characteristics and qualifications, teacher characteristics and qualifications, and teacher assignments in pilot DSSF districts (Henry, Rickman, Faircloth)
- Identified existing data on student performance, budgets and expenditures, principal characteristics and qualifications, and teacher characteristics and qualifications in non-DSSF districts (Henry, Rickman, Faircloth)
- Developed strategies and plans for collecting original data from DSSF districts and combining data with existing administrative data sets (Henry, Thompson, Rickman, Faircloth, Fortner)
- Reviewed and assessed the trustworthiness of research evidence on school-based strategies for improving student achievement and attainment of low-achieving students
- Specified statewide data needs from the Department of Public Instruction, identified key Department personnel to assist in providing data, and coordinated the transfer of data into a secure environment for analysis purposes (Rickman, Fortner, Faircloth)
- Received a transfer of data from the Department of Public Instruction concerning budgets and expenditures, principal characteristics and qualifications, teacher characteristics and qualifications, and teacher assignments in pilot DSSF districts (data on data on student performance and teacher assignments remains outstanding) (Rickman, Fortner, Faircloth)
- Received a transfer of data from the Department of Public Instruction concerning budgets and expenditures, principal qualifications and teacher qualifications in non-DSSF districts (data on data on student performance, some principal characteristics, and some teacher characteristics remains outstanding) (Rickman, Fortner, Faircloth)

- Specified analysis plans to estimate the effects of expenditures and strategies utilized by DSSF districts on teachers characteristics and student achievement (Henry, Rickman, Fortner)
- Reviewed research on principal leadership behavior (Thompson, Germuth, Fortner) and key instructional variables affecting learning outcomes for disadvantaged students (Thompson)
- Identified survey instruments to be used in adapted form to collect data on principal leadership behavior (Germuth, Thompson) and identified instruments and key instructional variables affecting student learning outcomes (Henry, Rickman, Fortner, Page)
- Developed protocols for data collection on local districts' implementation of DSSF strategies and flow of resources, developed and conducted training of data collectors (Rickman, Weaver)

Timeline and Deliverables for 2006

February – May

- Collect data from DSSF districts and a sample of 48 schools on the implementation of DSSF strategies in 2004-05 and 2005-06;
- Collect remaining data requested from Department of Public Instruction;
- Assemble data and initiate analysis on the DSSF expenditures, teacher characteristics and qualifications, principal characteristics and qualifications;
- Assemble data on student achievement, promotion, and graduation;
- Assemble class rolls and data on teacher assignments;
- Pilot test survey of principals' instructional leadership;
- Pilot test surveys of teachers' instructional practices.

May – September

- Prepare preliminary analysis of expenditures and teacher and principal qualifications;
- Assess ability to match teachers with students in existing administrative data;
- Analyze changes in student achievement;
- Analyze qualitative data on DSSF implementation and develop a data base of the strategies used in each of the DSSF districts 2004-05 and 2005-06;
- Develop protocols for collecting future data on DSSF implementation;
- Analyze pilot survey data on principal leadership and interaction with teachers concerning instruction and develop final instrument for future data collection; and
- Analyze pilot survey data on teachers' instructional practices and develop final instrument for future data collection.

September – December

- Obtain copies of district year three implementation plans;
- Analyze data on expenditures and teacher and principal qualifications;
- Obtain data on expenditures, teacher characteristics, and principal characteristics for 2005-06 and combine with earlier data;
- Analyze changes in student achievement in DSSF districts and other districts;
- Obtain data on student achievement from spring 2006;
- Analyze relationships between expenditures, strategies, and teacher qualifications;
- Develop sampling strategy for collecting data on instructional practices and principal leadership and interaction with teachers concerning instruction;
- Prepare preliminary report;
- Plan for collection of teachers' surveys, district implementation data; and
- Brief North Carolina Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction, and others concerning the preliminary results of the DSSF Pilot Study.

A preliminary report will be delivered by September 15, 2006 and a briefing of the State Board of Education and DPI personnel will follow. The final report on findings based on the 2005-06 school year will be available on December 15, 2006. Briefings will be scheduled for the State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction, and the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee in early 2007. Progress briefings will be scheduled as requested.

LEAAP ACTION PLAN

LEA _____ SUPERINTENDENT _____ DATE _____

LOCAL TEAM LEADER _____ CONTACT NUMBER _____

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (S)	STRATEGIES	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	RECIPIENTS OR PARTICIPANTS	TIME LINE	DESIRED OUTCOMES	EVALUATION MEASURES

(DUPLICATE AS OFTEN AS NECESSARY)

**BUDGET PLAN
for
LEAs Receiving Funds for Disadvantaged Students**

Improvement Objective: _____

Strategy(ies)	Funds Needed To Implement Strategy	Total Expenditure for Strategy

(Duplicate this form as often as necessary)

Superintendent _____ **Date** _____

Local Team Leader _____ **Date** _____

Approval Signatures

LEAAP Team Leader _____ **Date** _____

Associate Superintendent, Curriculum & School Reform _____ **Date** _____

State Finance Officer _____ **Date** _____

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding (DSSF)**

Budget Amendment Form – 2005-06

Directions: When a budget amendment is necessary, complete the following information and submit to Elsie Leak. The final amendments for 2005-06 should be postmarked no later than May 15, 2006. Amendments will not be accepted or processed after this date. Within 10 business days or less, a decision should be rendered and sent to the requesting LEA. This form may be duplicated as often as is necessary.

1.a. The current budgetary request:	Funds allocated:
1.b. The budgetary request written to reflect the change being requested:	Funding change:
1.c. Rationale for the change:.	

_____ Date _____
Finance Officer

_____ Date _____
Superintendent

_____ Date _____
LEAPP Team Chair

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SESSION 2005**

**SESSION LAW 2005-276
SENATE BILL 622**

AN ACT TO MAKE BASE BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS, INSTITUTIONS, AND AGENCIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

DISADVANTAGED STUDENT SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

SECTION 7.8.(a) Funds are appropriated in this act to address the capacity needs of local school administrative units to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. Each local school administrative unit shall use funds allocated to it for disadvantaged student supplemental funding to implement a plan jointly developed by the unit and the LEA Assistance Program team. The plan shall be based upon the needs of students in the unit not achieving grade-level proficiency. The plan shall detail how these funds shall be used in conjunction with all other supplemental funding allotments such as Low-Wealth, Small County, At-Risk Student Services/Alternative Schools, and Improving Student Accountability, to provide instructional and other services that meet the educational needs of these students. Prior to the allotment of disadvantaged student supplemental funds, the plan shall be approved by the State Board of Education.

Funds received for disadvantaged student supplemental funding shall be used, consistent with the policies and procedures adopted by the State Board of Education, only to:

- (1) Provide instructional positions or instructional support positions and/or professional development;
- (2) Provide intensive in-school and/or after-school remediation;
- (3) Purchase diagnostic software and progress-monitoring tools; and
- (4) Provide funds for teacher bonuses and supplements. The State Board of Education shall set a maximum percentage of the funds that may be used for this purpose.

The State Board of Education may require districts receiving funding under the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund to purchase the Education Value Added Assessment System in order to provide in-depth analysis of student performance and help identify strategies for improving student achievement. This data shall be used exclusively for instructional and curriculum decisions made in the best interest of children and for professional development for their teachers and administrators.

SECTION 7.8.(b) Funds are appropriated in this act to evaluate the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding Initiatives and Low-Wealth Initiatives. The State Board of Education shall use these funds to:

- (1) Evaluate the strategies implemented by local school administrative units with Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funds and Low-Wealth Funds and assess their impact on student performance; and
- (2) Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the technical assistance and support provided to local school administrative units by the Department of Public Instruction.

The State Board of Education shall report the results of the evaluation to the Office of State Budget and Management, the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, and the Fiscal Research Division by February 15, 2006, and by January 15 of each subsequent year.

