



## NORTH MYRTLE BEACH HIGH

3750 Sea Mountain  
Little River, SC 29566

<b>Grades</b>	9-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	1,308 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Trevor Strawderman	843-399-6171
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Cynthia Elsberry	843-488-6700
<b>Board Chair</b>	Will Garland	843-358-8002

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2011 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD



## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2011</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
2010	Good	Average
2009	Average	Below Average
2008	Average	Average
2007	Average	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
11	10	21	1	1

\* 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 (%)	79.6%	79.3%	83.6%	76.1%	77.9%	77.2%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	11.5%	12.3%	12.0%	12.7%	11.4%	13.2%
Passed no subtests (%)	8.9%	8.4%	4.5%	11.2%	11.0%	10.1%

**HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2011**

Percent	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
	94.0%	91.0%

**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	373	377	281	297
Number of Graduates in Cohort	274	295	198	205
Rate	73.5%	78.2%	71.3%	71.4%

\*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	373	N/A	293
Number of Graduates in Cohort	N/A	275	N/A	207
Rate	N/A	73.7%	N/A	69.5%

**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	90.4%	75.6%
English 1	79.3%	63.5%
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	79.8%	65.5%
Physical Science	73.5%	54.4%
US History and the Constitution	72.0%	44.3%
All Tests	77.8%	60.7%

\* 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=1,308)</b>				
Retention rate	0.6%	Down from 2.3%	4.0%	3.4%
Attendance rate	95.6%	Down from 96.0%	95.1%	95.0%
Served by gifted and talented program	29.2%	Up from 23.0%	13.8%	12.4%
With disabilities other than speech	12.0%	Down from 14.7%	11.0%	9.9%
Older than usual for grade	2.7%	Down from 6.2%	7.3%	7.1%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	0.5%	Down from 7.6%	0.8%	0.9%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	29.3%	Up from 22.7%	13.6%	13.0%
Successful on AP/IB exams	58.4%	Up from 41.7%	50.0%	51.7%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	55.8%	Up from 30.0%	30.1%	30.1%
Annual dropout rate	1.0%	Down from 7.1%	2.9%	2.5%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	1.5%	Up from 1.0%	1.9%	2.9%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	597	Down from 611	415	419
Students participating in work-based experiences	21.8%	Up from 3.5%	11.6%	7.2%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	83.9%	Up from 76.7%	80.9%	83.0%
Career/technology completers placed	100.0%	No Change	97.7%	98.4%
<b>Teachers (n=71)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	59.2%	Up from 53.4%	60.4%	61.1%
Continuing contract teachers	78.9%	Down from 79.5%	82.7%	80.6%
Teachers returning from previous year	86.2%	Down from 88.9%	88.1%	86.5%
Teacher attendance rate	94.5%	Up from 94.1%	95.5%	95.5%
Average teacher salary*	\$50,527	Down 1.2%	\$46,909	\$46,884
Professional development days/teacher	15.5 days	Up from 10.8 days	10.9 days	10.0 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	4.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	32.9 to 1	Down from 33.3 to 1	27.5 to 1	26.5 to 1
Prime instructional time	89.2%	No Change	89.2%	89.3%
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$7,995	Down 3.0%	\$7,397	\$7,804
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	55.6%	Up from 54.6%	57.2%	58.0%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	59.1%	Down from 60.1%	60.5%	60.6%
Opportunities in the arts	Excellent	No Change	Excellent	Excellent
SACS accreditation	Yes	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	89.6%	Down from 100.0%	97.5%	97.3%
Character development program	Below Average	No Change	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	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	318	94.0%	1460	77.8%	373	73.5%	No
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	160	93.1%	762	78.0%	181	64.1%	N/A
Female	158	94.9%	684	77.2%	192	82.3%	N/A
<b>Racial/Ethnic Group</b>							
White	215	96.7%	973	83.9%	237	72.6%	N/A
African American	83	88.0%	413	62.7%	110	77.3%	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	16	87.5%	49	73.5%	11	54.5%	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Disability Status</b>							
Disabled	39	66.7%	142	41.5%	34	67.6%	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	11	81.8%	37	64.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>							
Subsidized meals	154	90.3%	867	72.8%	191	68.6%	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**

The 2010-2011 school year has been a year of many accomplishments for North Myrtle Beach High School. There have been achievements both academically and athletically.

NMBHS was once again named a bronze award winner in the US News and World Report rankings of the nation's best high schools. NMBHS also earned a Palmetto Gold award for improvement in end-of-year performance among African- American students.

NMBHS had two more teachers achieve National Board Certification bringing the total number of teachers on staff to sixteen.

The senior class of 2011 earned more than \$7.1 million in scholarships. One hundred fifty-eight seniors qualified for the Life Scholarship.

The NMBHS Culinary Arts team, again, earned 1st place in the state culinary competition and traveled to compete in national competition. The NMBHS Mock Trial team claimed the state championship and competed in the national competition.

The NMBHS girls swim team, volleyball team, and girls track team won region championships. The volleyball team went on to compete for the lower state championship.

North Myrtle Beach High School is an outstanding high school with a very rich history. We look forward to continued collaboration with the community and school in order to produce one of the nation's premier schools.

Trevor Strawderman, Principal  
 Mary Gail Stanaland, Chairperson, School Improvement Council

**Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents**

	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Students*</b>	<b>Parents*</b>
Number of surveys returned	80	156	35
Percent satisfied with learning environment	83.5%	89.7%	97.0%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	96.3%	89.5%	84.8%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	71.3%	88.4%	90.6%

\* 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 16 out of 21 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**

	<b>Our District</b>	<b>State</b>
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	4.4%	1.7%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	1.8%	4.4%

  

	<b>Our School</b>	<b>State Objective</b>	<b>Met State Objective</b>
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	15.0%	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	305	96.7	6.5	23.6	33.7	36.2	76.4	73.4	68.0	Yes	Yes
Male	164	95.7	8.9	24.0	38.4	28.8	71.2	69.7	63.1	N/A	N/A
Female	141	97.9	3.8	23.1	28.5	44.6	82.3	77.3	73.1	N/A	N/A
White	205	97.1	3.3	18.0	32.8	45.9	85.2	81.0	79.4	Yes	Yes
African American	86	96.5	13.8	37.5	33.8	15.0	55.0	53.7	51.7	Yes	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	82.7	83.2	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	55.8	62.8	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	64.3	66.4	I/S	I/S
Disabled	52	88.5	33.3	45.2	16.7	4.8	31.0	33.2	22.8	Yes	No
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	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	30.7	45.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	188	96.3	9.6	28.7	37.1	24.6	69.5	64.5	54.7	Yes	Yes

<b>Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)</b>											
All Students	305	96.4	13.4	26.8	33.0	26.8	68.5	69.9	62.3	No	Yes
Male	164	95.7	14.4	24.7	33.6	27.4	70.5	69.4	61.4	N/A	N/A
Female	141	97.2	12.3	29.2	32.3	26.2	66.2	70.3	63.2	N/A	N/A
White	205	96.6	9.3	22.4	32.8	35.5	75.4	77.1	75.3	Yes	Yes
African American	86	96.5	23.8	40.0	28.8	7.5	50.0	47.9	42.9	Yes	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	84.6	84.3	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	61.2	59.4	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	78.6	64.1	I/S	I/S
Disabled	52	88.5	47.6	35.7	14.3	2.4	19.0	27.1	21.5	No	No
Migrant	0	N/A	I/S	N/A	N/A						
Limited English Proficient	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	38.7	47.1	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	188	96.3	19.8	30.5	33.5	16.2	59.9	61.3	48.5	Yes	Yes

<b>Biology 1/Applied Biology 2 (End-of-Course Test Performance by Group)</b>											
All Students	305	92.1	37.0	18.1	16.0	28.8	44.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	164	89.0	38.4	16.4	16.4	28.8	45.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	141	95.7	35.6	20.0	15.6	28.9	44.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	205	94.6	26.8	18.6	17.0	37.6	54.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	86	86.0	63.5	17.6	12.2	6.8	18.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	8	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	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	52	65.4	79.4	11.8	5.9	2.9	8.8	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	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	188	88.3	50.0	16.9	13.3	19.9	33.1	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	337	98.8	9.8	36.2	30.8	23.2	65.7	68.2	65.9
	2011	305	96.7	6.5	23.6	33.7	36.2	76.4	73.4	68.0

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

All Students	2010	337	98.5	16.2	36.3	24.8	22.6	57.6	68.1	62.3
	2011	305	96.4	13.4	26.8	33.0	26.8	68.5	69.9	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