



## NORTH CHARLESTON HIGH

1087 East Montague  
North Charleston, SC

<b>Grades</b>	9-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	619 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Robert Grimm	843-745-7140
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Nancy J. McGinley	843-937-6319
<b>Board Chair</b>	Mr. Chris Fraser	843-725-7200

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2011 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD



## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

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

## 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
4	2	8	10	11

\* 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 (%)	40.5%	45.7%	48.2%	58.5%	58.4%	61.1%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	22.2%	26.8%	21.8%	20.6%	19.3%	19.8%
Passed no subtests (%)	37.3%	27.5%	30.0%	23.7%	24.7%	19.1%

## HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2011

Percent	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
	73.1%	80.5%

## 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	295	255	123	122
Number of Graduates in Cohort	124	111	77	80
Rate	42.0%	43.5%	58.9%	63.6%

\*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	295	N/A	128
Number of Graduates in Cohort	N/A	133	N/A	86
Rate	N/A	45.1%	N/A	64.0%

## 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	47.4%	60.2%
English 1	45.1%	48.4%
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	26.9%	43.2%
Physical Science	29.9%	38.8%
US History and the Constitution	42.0%	26.2%
All Tests	37.8%	42.3%

\* 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=619)</b>				
Retention rate	7.3%	Down from 10.1%	4.4%	3.4%
Attendance rate	99.2%	Up from 91.0%	95.2%	95.0%
Served by gifted and talented program	2.3%	Up from 1.3%	4.5%	12.4%
With disabilities other than speech	16.7%	Down from 19.2%	12.5%	9.9%
Older than usual for grade	21.6%	Down from 31.2%	10.0%	7.1%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	5.3%	Down from 10.2%	1.6%	0.9%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	9.7%	Down from 11.4%	3.8%	13.0%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	13.9%	51.7%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	16.4%	Up from 15.5%	25.3%	30.1%
Annual dropout rate	8.9%	Up from 0.7%	2.0%	2.5%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	3.4%	Down from 4.9%	4.2%	2.9%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	312	Down from 351	219	419
Students participating in work-based experiences	0.0%	Down from 7.1%	0.0%	7.2%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	53.9%	Down from 65.3%	80.9%	83.0%
Career/technology completers placed	95.8%	Down from 100.0%	96.6%	98.4%
<b>Teachers (n=67)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	44.8%	Up from 41.3%	60.0%	61.1%
Continuing contract teachers	53.7%	Up from 45.3%	67.7%	80.6%
Teachers returning from previous year	66.8%	Down from 67.0%	79.1%	86.5%
Teacher attendance rate	96.4%	Up from 96.2%	95.3%	95.5%
Average teacher salary*	\$40,761	Down 1.3%	\$43,890	\$46,884
Professional development days/teacher	9.5 days	Down from 10.2 days	10.9 days	10.0 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	2.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	13.5 to 1	Up from 12.6 to 1	20.1 to 1	26.5 to 1
Prime instructional time	95.6%	Up from 85.3%	89.0%	89.3%
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$10,503	Up 2.1%	\$10,503	\$7,804
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	57.1%	Down from 57.3%	56.2%	58.0%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	59.7%	Down from 60.3%	59.1%	60.6%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	Down from Excellent	Good	Excellent
SACS accreditation	Yes	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	86.8%	Up from 76.6%	97.3%	97.3%
Character development program	Excellent	No Change	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Average	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	134	73.1%	675	37.8%	295	42.0%	No
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	63	69.8%	354	38.1%	155	38.1%	N/A
Female	71	76.1%	314	37.3%	140	46.4%	N/A
<b>Racial/Ethnic Group</b>							
White	N/A	N/A	43	62.8%	21	33.3%	N/A
African American	125	72.8%	591	35.2%	256	43.0%	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	31	51.6%	13	30.8%	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Disability Status</b>							
Disabled	23	30.4%	62	21.0%	37	29.7%	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	30	53.3%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>							
Subsidized meals	109	74.3%	553	38.0%	224	47.3%	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

We began the school year excited to spend an entire year in our new building with a few additions to our faculty and an expanded course of study. We were fortunate to add several community and business partnerships to the ones we already had. They contributed immensely to the progress we made during the 2010-2011 School year.

The year started with many challenges – student achievement and discipline topped our list of priorities. To meet these challenges, we created and implemented programs to meet the diverse needs of our students. One such program, ExALT, was designed to meet the individual needs of all students at NCHS by focusing on their needs in core subject areas, and placing a heavy emphasis on reading, writing and mathematics in preparation for HSAP and EOC testing. Teachers worked in teams with students to provide the extra support they needed. ExALT also provided students with opportunities for cultural and intellectual enrichment in activities such as chess, Black History, guitar, art, culinary arts, sewing, health sciences, Scrabble, Concert Band and Air Rifle (through the Naval ROTC). Because of the instructional strategies implemented this school year, we observed students who were more focused on doing well in their classes, and who readily participated in the required district and state tests.

We look forward to significant increases in achievement for our students.

We also implemented programs to reduce tardies and disciplinary issues in class, as well as increase student attendance. To reduce tardiness, we participated in the district's "Clean Sweep" program which required the combined efforts of students, parents, teachers, support staff and administrators. It worked! Additionally, students who committed lower level infractions in class were given conditional suspensions. This allowed them to return the next day with a parent or guardian for a conference, providing administrators and teachers the opportunity to significantly increase face-to-face conferences with parents. Suspensions and expulsions dropped to an all time low for our youngsters.

Some other accolades for our school were: We were the recipients of a federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) which allowed us to increase our teaching, guidance and parent advocate staff. The grant also allowed us to fully implement a Ninth Grade Academy (NGA). What a difference the grant made! Twenty-four of our students wrote a Book-In-A Day. Yes, a book in one day! We were the first school in South Carolina to participate in the Book-In-A Day project. The students attended a book signing in Charleston and New York City. The art department was a winner, for the second time, in the Charleston International Mural contest. Their mural will be hung in the Charleston International Airport.

This was a very good year! We are slowly, but surely and significantly closing the achievement gap at North Charleston High School.

Juanita Middleton, Principal  
Monroe Rhodes, School Improvement Chairman

## Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	13	72	29
Percent satisfied with learning environment	30.8%	60.6%	79.3%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	23.1%	70.8%	69.0%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	7.7%	78.9%	75.0%

\* 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 6 out of 13 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**

R

**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**

	<b>Our District</b>	<b>State</b>
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	2.7%	1.7%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	5.2%	4.4%

  

	<b>Our School</b>	<b>State Objective</b>	<b>Met State Objective</b>
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	11.3%	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
--	-------------------------------	----------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

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

All Students	116	93.1	35.1	47.9	10.6	6.4	25.5	71.8	68.0	No	Yes
Male	58	94.8	43.8	43.8	10.4	2.1	20.8	67.8	63.1	N/A	N/A
Female	58	91.4	26.1	52.2	10.9	10.9	30.4	75.6	73.1	N/A	N/A
White	10	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90.7	79.4	I/S	I/S
African American	100	92.0	38.3	46.9	9.9	4.9	22.2	51.9	51.7	No	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	89.7	83.2	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	66.3	62.8	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	66.4	I/S	I/S
Disabled	19	94.7	81.0	19.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	27.2	22.8	I/S	I/S
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	53.4	45.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	89	95.5	35.2	46.5	9.9	8.5	26.8	53.1	54.7	No	Yes

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

All Students	116	92.2	48.4	29.5	18.9	3.2	27.4	64.8	62.3	No	No
Male	58	91.4	50.0	27.1	20.8	2.1	29.2	64.7	61.4	N/A	N/A
Female	58	93.1	46.8	31.9	17.0	4.3	25.5	64.9	63.2	N/A	N/A
White	10	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85.9	75.3	I/S	I/S
African American	100	92.0	50.0	31.7	15.9	2.4	24.4	42.1	42.9	No	No
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	92.3	84.3	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	64.3	59.4	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	64.1	I/S	I/S
Disabled	19	94.7	85.7	14.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.9	21.5	I/S	I/S
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	55.2	47.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	89	94.4	46.5	29.6	19.7	4.2	31.0	43.7	48.5	Yes	Yes

Biology 1/Applied Biology 2 (End-of-Course Test Performance by Group)

All Students	116	93.1	89.8	7.4	0.9	1.9	2.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	58	91.4	90.6	7.5	1.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	58	94.8	89.1	7.3	N/A	3.6	3.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	10	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	100	95.0	91.6	6.3	1.1	1.1	2.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	1	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	19	78.9	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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	89	93.3	89.2	7.2	1.2	2.4	3.6	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	141	98.6	39.8	40.7	14.6	4.9	29.3	69.8	65.9
	2011	116	93.1	35.1	47.9	10.6	6.4	25.5	71.8	68.0

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

All Students	2010	141	96.5	42.5	42.5	11.7	3.3	24.2	64.2	62.3
	2011	116	92.2	48.4	29.5	18.9	3.2	27.4	64.8	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