Nature Coast Technical High

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Nature Coast Technical High

4057 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

https://www.hernandoschools.org/ncths

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Nature Coast Technical High School faculty and staff will collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure that our students acquire the knowledge and skills to successfully participate in a competitive global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Nature Coast Sharks swimming toward success!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Noyes, Toni Ann	Principal
Williams, Dawn	Assistant Principal
Loder, Pam	Assistant Principal
Buel, Gary	Assistant Principal
Beach, Shaizey	Teacher, K-12
Erickson, Lori	Teacher, K-12
Gore, Emily	Teacher, K-12
Masserio, Lisa	Teacher, PreK
Champagne, Gregory	Teacher, K-12
LaRocca, Jodi	Teacher, K-12
Stevens, Donna	Teacher, K-12
Kelly, Tania	School Counselor
Moonan, Francis	Teacher, K-12
Benvegna, Meredith	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Toni-Ann Noyes, Principal - Lead Facilitator
Gary Buel - SIP Implemention, Oversees Math and CTE Departments
Pam Loder - PD Development and implementation, SIP Implementation, Oversees ESE and CTE Departments
Dawn Williams, Assistant Principal - Data analysis, SIP Implementation, and Oversees Curriculum, ELA, Reading, Social Studies, and Science Departments
Jodi LaRocca, Assessment, Data collection and distribution
Tania Kelly, Guidance Department Head, RtI and Credit Recovery
Lisa Masserio, Reading Department Head, SIP Implementation and Teacher Support

Greg Champagne, Social Studies Department Head, SIP Implementation and Teacher Support
Donna Stevens, ESE Department Head, SIP Implementation and Teacher Support
Francis Moonan, Science Department Head, SIP Implementation and Teacher Support
Meredith Benvegna, English SIP Implementation and Teacher Support

Additional responsibilities of the School Leadership Team are to analyze and monitor student data and achievement. SLT will meet once a month to analyze Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) data focusing on standards-based instruction, analyze student common formative assessments to ensure students are making progress and rigorous instruction is being practiced in every classroom. SLT will meet after each common 9 Week assessment to ensure that students are making progress.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	17	14	31	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	10	6	13	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	27	87	41	238
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	78	63	51	245
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	90	80	92	0	417

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected
Monday 8/27/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	31	54	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	17	33	90
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	78	36	42	207
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	45	33	25	144
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	86	82	76	323

Year 2016-17 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	31	54	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	17	33	90
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	78	36	42	207
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	45	33	25	144
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	86	82	76	323

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Math Lowest 25th Percentile performed the lowest. No this is not a trend. We dropped from 40% making gains to 37%. We have historically under-performed in this category.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Biology. We dropped from 70% level 3 or above to 56%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Biology. State average is 77% level 3 or higher and NCT average is 56%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math achievement. Yes we have been trending up for the last three years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Math teachers using more rigorous, standards-based instruction and building and maintaining the capacity of our math teachers.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	48%	56%	50%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	48%	53%	40%	37%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	39%	44%	25%	26%	38%
Math Achievement	62%	47%	51%	45%	45%	43%
Math Learning Gains	47%	43%	48%	35%	40%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	40%	45%	28%	33%	38%
Science Achievement	56%	58%	67%	62%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	68%	71%	75%	71%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	139 (20)	17 (26)	14 (31)	31 (54)	201 (131)
One or more suspensions	53 (16)	10 (24)	6 (17)	13 (33)	82 (90)
Course failure in ELA or Math	83 (51)	27 (78)	87 (36)	41 (42)	238 (207)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	53 (41)	78 (45)	63 (33)	51 (25)	245 (144)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2018	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
	2017	55%	46%	9%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
10	2018	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%
	2017	55%	42%	13%	50%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	56%	58%	-2%	65%	-9%
2017	76%	67%	9%	63%	13%
Compare		-20%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	70%	68%	2%	68%	2%
2017	71%	69%	2%	67%	4%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
2017	60%	59%	1%	60%	0%
Compare		13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	52%	45%	7%	56%	-4%
2017	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	38	42	30	37	29	24	39		78	28
ELL	16	35	42	26	26	9	33				
ASN	73	46		67	30						
BLK	28	37	36	30	49	48	27	52		86	20
HSP	45	41	39	52	37	21	54	66		93	58
MUL	43	24		63	56		36	50			
WHT	63	50	47	70	51	44	64	75		90	61
FRL	46	43	40	53	44	34	50	60		88	48

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	38	35	19	33	36	37	45		60	28
ELL	30	52	39	32	39	36	55				
ASN				73	55						
BLK	43	36	28	22	25	38	43	79		88	48
HSP	46	47	41	50	40	46	77	58		78	58
MUL	55	48		50	40		77				
WHT	60	50	54	54	41	40	80	75		90	62
FRL	48	46	48	44	42	42	71	73		84	54

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	NCTHS will continue to increase standards-based instruction in the core curriculum to increase student achievement.
Rationale	While our ELA achievement score of 55% proficient, is 13% above the District and 2% above the State proficiency levels it is still too low.. If we can increase proficiency in ELA then Us History and Biology EOC proficiency will increase as well.
Intended Outcome	9th grade ELA proficiency rates will continue to increase from 57% to 60% and we will increase 10th grade ELA proficiency by 5% to 57%.
Point Person	Toni Ann Noyes (noyes_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	One Assistant Principal will oversee the English Language Arts, Social Studies and Science department to ensure that all teachers are teaching rigorous, standards-based instruction. All teachers will be provided with a copy of Common Core Reading Standards for Literature and Informational Text Graphic Organizers. The expectation will be that the organizers will be used routinely to help student navigate through multiple rigorous reading texts. The textbook will no longer be the single source of reading in these three subject areas. Teachers are expected to design lessons using multiple texts that also includes a writing component. All administrators will be expecting to see students actively engaged with authentic subject area texts, students discussing those texts, and writing about them.
Person Responsible	Dawn Williams (williams_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Classroom Walkthrough data, increases in achievement on 9 Week Exams, and student test data.
Person Responsible	Toni Ann Noyes (noyes_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	NCTHS will continue to increase standards-based instruction in the math curriculum to increase student achievement.
Rationale	In 2016 only 28% of students in the Lowest Quartile made a learning gain. In 2017 we increased learning gains of the LQ to 40%, however, this year we dropped to 37% of LQ making a gain.
Intended Outcome	In 2019, 45% of students in the LQ will make a learning gain.
Point Person	Toni Ann Noyes (noyes_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	LQ students will be placed into Algebra I study halls to receive additional academic support. Administration will attend Math Department Meetings to discuss data trends both positive and negative and problem-solve to eliminate negative data trends. Math teachers will integrate Khan Academy into their lessons.
Person Responsible	Toni Ann Noyes (noyes_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Classroom walkthrough data analysis, increases in achievement on 9 Week Exams, lesson plan review, and student test data.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Part V: Budget

Total:	$0.00