

Hernando County School District

Nature Coast Technical High



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Nature Coast Technical High

4057 CALIFORNIA ST, Brooksville, FL 34604

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ncths>

Demographics

Principal: Toni Ann Noyes

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	C

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Noyes, Toni Ann	Principal	Lead Facilitator
Loder, Pam	Assistant Principal	PD development and implementation; SIP implementation; Oversees ESE and CTE departments
Buel, Gary	Assistant Principal	SIP implementation; Safety and Drill Coordinator; Oversees Math, PE, and CTE departments
Beach, Shaizey	Teacher, K-12	Foreign Language department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Gore, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Physical Education department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Masserio, Lisa	Teacher, PreK	Reading department chair and ESOL Lead ; SIP implementation and teacher support
Champagne, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
LaRocca, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher; Data collection, analysis, and distribution
Stevens, Donna	Teacher, K-12	ESE department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Kelly, Tania	School Counselor	Guidance department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support; Oversees Equal Opportunity Schools and credit recovery
Moonan, Francis	Teacher, K-12	Science department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Benvegna, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	English department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Maner, Josandra	Assistant Principal	Data analysis; SIP implementation; Oversees curriculum, ELA, Reading, Science, and Social Studies departments
Fry, Ed	Teacher, K-12	CTE department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support
Peeples, Kristin	Dean	Teacher on Administrative Assignment; MTSS and ESSA monitor; SIP implementation and teacher support
Ferlita, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Math department chair; SIP implementation and teacher support

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	349	408	323	309	1389
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	72	62	68	255
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	27	14	9	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	46	185
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	14	16	67

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	14	16	67

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	11	23

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

75

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - 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	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	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	49%	56%	56%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	45%	51%	49%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	36%	42%	48%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	66%	51%	51%	51%	49%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	45%	48%	40%	40%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	38%	45%	40%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	68%	68%	77%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	71%	73%	72%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	349 (0)	408 (0)	323 (0)	309 (0)	1389 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	53 (139)	72 (17)	62 (14)	68 (31)	255 (201)
One or more suspensions	23 (53)	27 (10)	14 (6)	9 (13)	73 (82)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (83)	83 (27)	56 (87)	46 (41)	185 (238)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15 (53)	22 (78)	14 (63)	16 (51)	67 (245)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	58%	49%	9%	53%	5%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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
2019	72%	67%	5%	67%	5%
2018	56%	58%	-2%	65%	-9%
Compare		16%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	70%	3%	70%	3%
2018	70%	68%	2%	68%	2%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	59%	11%	61%	9%
2018	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	55%	7%	57%	5%
2018	52%	45%	7%	56%	-4%
Compare		10%			

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	32	29	33	51	48	30	41		74	36
ELL	20	21	10	33	29		50	45			
ASN	64	62		82	80						
BLK	27	34	32	37	32	22	40	39		90	42
HSP	54	46	35	63	47	33	69	66		92	66
MUL	63	50	55	71	46		76				
WHT	63	53	39	70	52	48	76	79		90	66
FRL	48	44	32	60	51	43	61	67		87	57

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				

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
WHT	60	50	54	54	41	40	80	75		90	62
FRL	48	46	48	44	42	42	71	73		84	54

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA Achievement. The contributing factors to last year's performance is low achievement by the SWD, ELL and Black subgroups.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline from the previous year was the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA. The factors that contributed was the decline in proficiency of four subgroups; SWD, ELL, FRL and White.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap was in the learning gains of math in the lowest 25th percentile. The low proficiency in this area of the black and Hispanic subgroups.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science Achievement was the component that showed the most improvement. New actions the school took last year was increasing the focus on standards-based instruction in the core content areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The one area that could be a potential concern is the 83 students in grade 10 who have failed ELA or math representing 20% of that population.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA overall Proficiency
2. Lowest quartile gains in both ELA and Math
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	NCTHS will continue to increase standards-based instruction in the ELA and math curriculum to increase student achievement.
Rationale	While our ELA achievement score increased to 58% proficient, which is 11% above the District and 2% above the State proficiency levels it is still too low. Students in Algebra I are traditionally included in the bottom quartile because they lack the basic skills needed to be proficient in math. According to the school data, the Algebra 1 achievement data showed a decrease of 3% from 73% to 70%. Which we feel attributed to the 40% lower quartile proficiency in math in 2019. If we can continue to increase the use of standards-based instruction, the proficiency of our lower performing subgroups in ELA and Algebra will increase, which in turn, will increase overall achievement in both areas as well.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We intend to increase the ELA proficiency rates of the SWD by 5% to 19%, Black by 5% to 32%, and ELL lowest quartile gains by 5% to 15%. In 2020, we will increase our lowest quartile gains by 5% to 45% which should help increase Algebra 1 proficiency to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Toni Ann Noyes (noyes_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	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 using literacy standards across all content areas. All English teachers will be provided professional development implementing literacy standards in the ELA classroom. Teachers and administration will collaborate with District Reading coach for instructional support focused on instructional delivery, student engagement, and differentiated instruction. The expectation will be that the various literacy strategies will be used routinely to help students navigate through multiple rigorous reading texts. Teachers will also continue to implement core connection strategies. All administrators will be expecting to see standards-based instruction and authentic student engagement in all classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Incoming 9th graders who were non-proficient on the 8th grade FSA math assessment have been scheduled in Algebra 1A/1B to provide an extra block of intensive instruction.. ELA teachers may or may not be reading endorsed meaning most of them do not have sufficient knowledge of the literacy standards. When working with multiple informational pieces of text it is imperative that students are given the strategies needed to help them succeed in mastering the standards. Differentiated instructional strategies are extremely important when instructing low performing subgroups whose proficiency levels in ELA are below expectations at 14% for SWD, 27% for Black, and the lowest quartile for ELL at 10%. An extra block of intensive math will address the gaps in achievement and provide instruction in the foundational skills these students are lacking.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA professional development on early release days including administration for monitoring 2. ELA administrator walk-through with feedback 3. PIT Crew support provided for SWD students. Administration and ESE department head will monitor

progress quarterly using D/F reports and MTSS progress monitoring plan.

4. Staff mentoring program for black students. Administration and lead mentor will monitor progress quarterly.

5. Additional block of Algebra for non-proficient 9th grade students. It will be monitored through D/F reports and Alecks progress monitoring.

6. Study Hall boot camp before the scheduled Algebra EOC. The math department head and guidance will be responsible for scheduling.

Person Responsible Josandra Maner (maner_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).