



## BEAUFORT HIGH

84 Sea Island Parkway  
Beaufort, South Carolina

<b>Grades</b>	9-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	1,594 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Dr. Daniel Durbin	843-322-2000
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Valerie Truesdale	843-322-2300
<b>Board Chair</b>	Fred Washington	843-322-2356

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2011 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD



## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2011</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Below Average</b>
2010	Average	At-Risk
2009	Average	Below Average
2008	Average	Excellent
2007	Below Average	At-Risk

## DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Below Average – School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- At-Risk – School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE VISION

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities.

<http://ed.sc.gov>  
<http://eoc.sc.gov>

**ABSOLUTE RATINGS OF HIGH SCHOOLS WITH STUDENTS LIKE OURS**

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	At-Risk
17	6	8	0	0

\* Ratings are calculated with data available by 11/09/2011.

**High School Assessment Program (HSAP) Exam Passage Rate: Second Year Students**

Percent	Our High School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Passed 2 subtests (%)	71.5%	74.5%	75.0%	77.7%	80.7%	83.6%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	16.7%	14.8%	15.8%	12.2%	10.9%	9.9%
Passed no subtests (%)	11.8%	10.7%	9.2%	10.2%	8.7%	7.0%

**HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2011**

Percent	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
	90.6%	93.3%

**Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate**

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2010*	2011	2010	2011
Number of Students in Four-Year Cohort	510	485	379	362
Number of Graduates in Cohort	331	345	278	276
Rate	64.9%	71.1%	72.5%	72.3%

\*Used to calculate current AYP.

**Five-Year Graduation Rate**

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2010	2011	2010	2011
Number of Students in Cohort	N/A	510	N/A	409
Number of Graduates in Cohort	N/A	334	N/A	310
Rate	N/A	65.5%	N/A	77.0%

**End of Course Tests**

Percent of tests with scores of 70 or above on:	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours*
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	69.0%	78.9%
English 1	77.2%	70.0%
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	69.5%	73.2%
Physical Science	60.3%	61.3%
US History and the Constitution	46.1%	52.6%
All Tests	64.1%	66.6%

\* High Schools with Poverty Indices of no more than 5% above or below the index for this school.

**Abbreviations for Missing Data**

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

School Profile

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
<b>Students (n=1,594)</b>				
Retention rate	1.8%	Down from 9.9%	3.1%	3.4%
Attendance rate	99.9%	Up from 99.8%	95.0%	95.0%
Served by gifted and talented program	24.3%	Up from 16.7%	17.9%	12.4%
With disabilities other than speech	5.8%	Down from 8.1%	8.7%	9.9%
Older than usual for grade	5.4%	Down from 10.1%	4.9%	7.1%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	2.6%	Up from 1.7%	0.9%	0.9%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	29.5%	Down from 49.2%	18.2%	13.0%
Successful on AP/IB exams	47.5%	Up from 28.0%	54.1%	51.7%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	29.2%	Down from 29.9%	34.8%	30.1%
Annual dropout rate	1.6%	Up from 0.6%	2.8%	2.5%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	3.3%	Up from 0.4%	2.0%	2.9%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	895	Down from 1008	691	419
Students participating in work-based experiences	7.7%	Down from 18.0%	11.1%	7.2%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	76.9%	Up from 70.7%	83.0%	83.0%
Career/technology completers placed	97.6%	Down from 97.7%	98.0%	98.4%
<b>Teachers (n=94)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	66.0%	Up from 65.3%	63.3%	61.1%
Continuing contract teachers	76.6%	Down from 76.8%	84.0%	80.6%
Teachers returning from previous year	86.4%	Down from 87.3%	88.3%	86.5%
Teacher attendance rate	93.4%	Down from 94.0%	95.5%	95.5%
Average teacher salary*	\$52,040	Up 1.1%	\$48,464	\$46,884
Professional development days/teacher	13.7 days	Up from 10.0 days	11.3 days	10.0 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	8.0	No Change	5.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	31.2 to 1	Down from 32.2 to 1	28.6 to 1	26.5 to 1
Prime instructional time	90.6%	Down from 91.0%	89.3%	89.3%
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$6,802	Down 0.8%	\$7,142	\$7,804
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	64.9%	Up from 62.5%	58.5%	58.0%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	68.1%	Up from 66.2%	62.0%	60.6%
Opportunities in the arts	Excellent	No Change	Excellent	Excellent
SACS accreditation	Yes	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	100.0%	Up from 50.0%	96.6%	97.3%
Character development program	Good	No Change	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Good	Good
Classical language program assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good

\* Includes current year teachers contracted for 185 or more days.

\*\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

Performance By Student Groups

	HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2011		End of Course Tests Passage Rate		On-time Graduation Rate, 2010 For AYP		Met AYP Objective
	n	%	t	%	n	%	
All Students	381	90.6%	1720	64.1%	510	64.9%	No
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	203	90.1%	806	63.0%	244	59.4%	N/A
Female	178	91.0%	875	65.3%	265	69.8%	N/A
<b>Racial/Ethnic Group</b>							
White	176	96.6%	889	79.5%	226	69.5%	N/A
African American	178	83.1%	709	46.1%	246	61.4%	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	20	100.0%	73	53.4%	25	60.0%	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Disability Status</b>							
Disabled	21	66.7%	91	15.4%	31	64.5%	N/A
<b>Migrant Status</b>							
Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>English Proficiency</b>							
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	24	41.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>							
Subsidized meals	144	81.9%	732	48.8%	211	57.3%	N/A

NOTE: n=number of students on which percentage is calculated; t=number of tests taken.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

Report of Principal and School Improvement Council

During the 2010-11 school year, the Beaufort High School Staff completed its fifth full year of the small schools model. Stakeholder surveys indicated that the model had high marks for career focus, structural competence, and providing a safe environment.

The school saw a dramatic rise in EOC scores in all subject areas. Most impressive was an overall score of 80 in the English EOC. In addition, SAT scores recorded a 30 point overall increase. This was mainly attributed to several initiatives implemented by the staff. The first initiative was the utilization of U.S. TestPrep to establish benchmark scores for students in each subject area. Teachers utilized this data to deconstruct standards and focus on student knowledge gaps. Additional test were administered to monitor student progress.

The second initiative was the establishment of everyday math and English for incoming freshmen that scored in the lower third of their competency tests in middle school. Teachers were trained to identify student gaps and provide direct support to close those gaps. The APEX program was utilized to support additional focus on those gaps. In addition, teachers utilized U.S. TestPrep to establish bench marks and monitor student progress.

A third initiative was the establishment of a learning lab to assist students that were at-risk of failing the state HSAP examination. The lab was manned by certified teachers that volunteered a portion of their planning periods. This provided students with one-to-one instruction.

Staff development was founded on each teacher completing 30 hours of advanced technology training. A technology specialist worked with teachers to improve both instruction support skills and data interpretations skills. This initiative played a major role in preparing teachers to work with student data and instruction.

Daniel H. Durbin, Principal  
 Brad Samuel, SIC Chairperson

Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	58	290	51
Percent satisfied with learning environment	78.9%	59.2%	80.4%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	84.2%	73.8%	69.4%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	58.9%	84.0%	64.0%

\* Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without grade eleven, only the highest grade was included.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

School Adequate Yearly Progress

No

This school met 10 out of 17 objectives. The objectives included student performance, graduation rate or student attendance, and participation in the state testing program.

Definition: As required by the United States Department of Education, Adequate Yearly Progress specifies that the statewide target is met for "All Students" and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency in the areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as meeting the statewide target for "All Students" for attendance or graduation rate.

School Improvement Status

N/A

School Improvement Key

<b>NI</b>	Newly Identified-The school missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two years. Sanction: Offer school choice.
<b>CSI</b>	Continuing School Improvement-The school missed AYP for three years. Sanctions: Continue school choice and implement supplemental services.
<b>CA</b>	Corrective Action-The school missed AYP for four years. Sanction: Continue school choice and supplemental services. The school district takes a corrective action.
<b>RP</b>	Plan to Restructure-Sanctions: Continue school choice and supplemental services. Develop a plan to restructure. If the school misses AYP the next year, the school implements the restructuring plan.
<b>R</b>	Restructure-The school missed AYP after two years of corrective action. Sanctions: Implement the restructuring plan. Continue school choice and supplemental services.
<b>DELAY</b>	The school met AYP in all subgroups and the indicator for one year, thus the delay provision applies. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Delay."
<b>HOLD</b>	The school made progress for one year in the subject area that identified the school for school improvement. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Hold."

Teacher Quality Data

	Our District	State
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	4.6%	1.7%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	10.4%	4.4%

  

	Our School	State Objective	Met State Objective
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	13.2%	0.0%	No

Abbreviations for Missing Data

HSAP Performance By Group

	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*	Performance Objective Met	Participation Objective Met
<b>English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)</b>											
All Students	397	99.0	11.2	31.2	26.7	30.9	66.1	67.0	68.0	No	Yes
Male	189	98.4	14.6	38.2	23.0	24.2	57.3	61.7	63.1	N/A	N/A
Female	208	99.5	8.1	24.9	29.9	37.1	74.1	72.8	73.1	N/A	N/A
White	187	98.4	6.2	18.6	26.6	48.6	83.1	86.0	79.4	Yes	Yes
African American	186	99.5	17.0	44.3	26.7	11.9	47.7	46.4	51.7	No	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	82.4	83.2	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	19	100.0	5.9	29.4	29.4	35.3	76.5	57.4	62.8	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	66.4	I/S	I/S
Disabled	32	100.0	51.6	48.4	N/A	N/A	6.5	26.0	22.8	I/S	I/S
Migrant	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	41.0	45.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	193	100.0	16.7	43.0	24.7	15.6	49.5	50.0	54.7	No	Yes

<b>Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)</b>											
All Students	397	99.0	22.7	27.2	27.2	22.9	58.4	60.0	62.3	No	Yes
Male	189	98.4	23.6	26.4	30.3	19.7	56.2	59.3	61.4	N/A	N/A
Female	208	99.5	21.8	27.9	24.4	25.9	60.4	60.8	63.2	N/A	N/A
White	187	98.4	11.3	17.5	33.9	37.3	75.7	79.8	75.3	Yes	Yes
African American	186	99.5	35.8	35.8	22.2	6.3	39.8	37.7	42.9	No	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	76.5	84.3	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	19	100.0	5.9	41.2	17.6	35.3	70.6	52.0	59.4	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	64.1	I/S	I/S
Disabled	32	100.0	77.4	19.4	3.2	N/A	6.5	18.7	21.5	I/S	I/S
Migrant	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	36.9	47.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	193	100.0	34.4	34.9	23.7	7.0	41.9	42.6	48.5	No	Yes

<b>Biology 1/Applied Biology 2 (End-of-Course Test Performance by Group)</b>											
All Students	397	96.5	59.5	14.6	12.0	13.8	25.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	189	95.2	61.7	15.6	10.0	12.8	22.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	208	97.6	57.6	13.8	13.8	14.8	28.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	187	95.7	38.5	19.0	18.4	24.0	42.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	186	96.8	81.7	10.0	5.0	3.3	8.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	19	100.0	52.6	21.1	21.1	5.3	26.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	32	81.3	96.2	3.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	193	96.4	79.0	10.2	8.1	2.7	10.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

**Two-Year HSAP Trend Data**

	School Year	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*
--	-------------	-------------------------------	----------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

**English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)**

All Students	2010	448	92.9	13.3	30.0	30.0	26.8	65.3	62.5	65.9
	2011	397	99.0	11.2	31.2	26.7	30.9	66.1	67.0	68.0

**Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)**

All Students	2010	448	93.1	20.9	32.1	24.6	22.4	58.2	55.4	62.3
	2011	397	99.0	22.7	27.2	27.2	22.9	58.4	60.0	62.3

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A--Not Applicable    N/AV--Not Available    N/C--Not Collected    N/R--Not Reported    I/S--Insufficient Sample