

Pacific Elementary School

6201 41st Street • Sacramento, CA 95824 • 916.433.5089 • Grades K-6

Tara L. Lampkins, Principal

Tara-Lampkins@scusd.edu

2015-16 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2016-17 School Year



Sacramento City Unified School District

5735 47th Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95824
(916) 643-7400
www.scusd.edu

District Governing Board

Jay Hansen President, Area 1
Jessie Ryan, 1st VP, Area 7
Darrel Woo 2nd VP, Area 6
Ellen Cochrane, Area 2
Christina Pritchett, Area 3
Michael Minnick, Area 4
Mai Vang, Area 5
Natalie Rosas, Student Member

District Administration

José L. Banda, Superintendent
Superintendent
Lisa Allen
Deputy Superintendent
Chad Sweitzer
Area Assistant Superintendent
Tu Moua-Carroz
Area Assistant Superintendent
Olga L. Simms
Area Assistant Superintendent
Mary Hardin Young
Area Assistant Superintendent

School Description

Our Vision: All Students Will Achieve At High Levels

Where academic improvements are needed, the Pacific Staff and School Site Council have spent time analyzing and monitoring achievement data in order to make instructional adjustments for improving student outcomes. The following items reflect major components of the plan for improving academic achievement at Pacific School:

Teachers collaborate in grade level or school-wide teams at least 1 time per week after school.

Grade level teams have participated in 2-3 ELA Coaching Cycles and 2-3 Math Coaching Cycles with district training specialists. Also, Grade level teams regularly met with district ELA/Math training specialists during grade level CPT.

All students are eligible to receive Supplemental Educational Services (tutoring) and all students have access to grade level computer intervention (iReady & ST Math).

The process for the development of the 2016-2017 was collaborative and included the voice of all stakeholders. Below identified the dates and activities regarding budget planning:

1. 9/30/15...School Site Council, ELAC, and Safety Committee met as a group and reviewed and discussed 2015-16 SPSA, goals, and expenditures from General Fund, Title 1, LEP, and Free & Reduced. LCAP and school goals and costs were shared and discussed while considering goals and budget for 2016-2017.
2. 10/15/15...Curriculum Meeting...Staff looked at student assessments to recommend students to extended day tutoring with paid Pacific teachers to increase academic achievement in ELA/Math.
3. 10/28/15...SSC/ELAC, & Safety Committee shared and discussed school programs and budget balances (Title 1, F/R, LEP) to match goals. School wide focus changed to Common Core State Standards from High Quality First Instruction.
4. 11/18/15...SSC/ELAC, & Safety Committee reviewed student, parent, certificated, and classified survey. Survey was important to direct our focus to increasing academic achievement using CCSS, teacher training, parent engagement, and school safety.
5. 12/16/15...SSC/ELAC, & Safety Committee reviewed guidelines to increase academic achievement using PI Program Improvement Funds for academic interventions. Suggestion included expenditures: 30 Macbook Air Laptops with cart, ST Math license renewal, iREady license renewal, Extended Day Learning & staff, overhead projectors, and other items.
6. 1/21/16...Curriculum Meeting...Staff shared, analyzed, and discussed formative/informative classroom assessments, student iReady & ST Math scores, Benchmark scores, and intervention strategies to increase academic achievement.
7. 9/22/15, 11/19/2015...CPT...Pacific staff participated in Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training and shared, discussed needed strategies to apply Social Emotional Learning in the classroom and to increase academic, social, and emotional achievement.
8. 1/19/15...SBDM...Team shared and discussed the school wide survey that ranked PI Intervention spending recommendations. Results recommended the purchase of a Laptop Cart with 30 computers, ST Math license renewal, and A-Z Reading Book licenses for 2016-2017 school year.
8. 1/27/16...Principal presented 2016-2017 Budget Development Plan to SSC, ELAC, and Safety Committees. School Site Council, ELAC, and Safety shared, analyzed, and discussed the budget development plan. School Site Council approved the 2016-2017 budget at this meeting 8-0.

9. 2/24/16...SSC/ELAC, & Safety Committee...SSC approved the expenditure on a parking lot fence to increase student safety and moving Kinder fence back to increase Kinder play area \$2,106. ALSO, SSC shared, analyzed, discussed, and APPROVED the purchase of 30 MacBook Air Computers with computer cart, ST Math license renewal, and Learning A-Z Books using PI Intervention money. In addition, SSC shared, discussed, and approved \$1000 cost to continue Strings Program on campus through 6/11/2016.
10. Continuous biweekly paid CPT (paid after 18 hours) to focus on unit planning, assessments, student engagement, professional development,
11. 2/24/16...Teaching staff recommend adding additional aides in the classroom to support EL student achievement and adding more laptop computers, too.

About the SARC

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

2015-16 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	107
Grade 1	115
Grade 2	104
Grade 3	107
Grade 4	84
Grade 5	96
Grade 6	80
Total Enrollment	693

2015-16 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	12.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7
Asian	22.5
Filipino	1
Hispanic or Latino	52.5
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2.9
White	5.2
Two or More Races	2.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85.6
English Learners	40.7
Students with Disabilities	7.1
Foster Youth	0.7

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

Teacher Credentials			
Pacific Elementary School	14-15	15-16	16-17
With Full Credential	23	25	27
Without Full Credential	0	1	1
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
Sacramento City Unified School District	14-15	15-16	16-17
With Full Credential	♦	♦	1574
Without Full Credential	♦	♦	83
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	♦	♦	20

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Pacific Elementary School	14-15	15-16	16-17
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	3	3	0

* "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc. Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers

2015-16 Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers		
Location of Classes	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	95.8	4.2
Districtwide		
All Schools	83.9	16.1
High-Poverty Schools	83.1	16.9
Low-Poverty Schools	97.0	3.1

* High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2016-17)

Textbooks and instructional materials are reviewed and then piloted across the district. Subsequent adoption by the Board of Education is consistent with the cycle of textbook approval by the State, California School Board. Textbooks are chosen for their alignment with California Content Standards, California Frameworks, and appropriateness for Sacramento City Unified School District students. Textbook sufficiency data is collected annually.

Textbooks and Instructional Materials Year and month in which data were collected: December 2016	
Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts	Open Court Reading, SRA Arts Reading/Language 2002 Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
Mathematics	enVisionMATH California Common Core 2015-Pearson-K-6th Mathematics 2014 Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
Science	California Science, McMillian McGraw-Hill Science 2008 Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
History-Social Science	California Vistas, McMillian McGraw-Hill History/Social Science 2007 Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
Foreign Language	Moving Into English, Harcourt English Language Development 2004 Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The main campus was built in 1951. This school has 16 permanent classrooms which include a multipurpose room, a library, and an administrative building. The school also has 22 portables. 3 portables classrooms were constructed in 1997 and 3 in 1998 for class size reduction. During the 1999 modernization, renovations and upgrades were made in the following areas: health and safety, HVAC, portable buildings and miscellaneous upgrades.

The district takes great efforts to ensure that all schools are clean, safe, and functional. District maintenance staff ensures that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order process is used to ensure efficient service and that emergency repairs are given the highest priority. The district governing board has adopted cleaning standards for all the schools in the district. A summary of these standards is available at the school office, or at the district operations office. The principal works directly with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school.

The State Legislature established the Deferred Maintenance Fund (DMF) in 1980 to assist districts in maintaining facilities and sites. The District has participated in the Deferred Maintenance Program since its inception. The program requires both the local district and the State of California to share equally in the cost of major deferred maintenance projects, with the maximum contribution from the State limited to approximately one-half of one percent of the District's General Fund and Adult Education Fund operating budgets. For fiscal years 2008-09 through 2012-13, the Deferred Maintenance Program has been included in the State's Tier III Flexibility Program. Therefore, DMF funds received by the District are deposited in the General Fund, and are unrestricted. Due to state budget cuts for 2010-11 these unrestricted funds have not been designated to deferred maintenance purposes. The funds were used as part of the Tier III recommendations approved by the Board on the May 6, 2010 Board Meeting.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 9/19/16				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
Interior: Interior Surfaces	X			
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
Year and month in which data were collected: 9/19/16

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Electrical: Electrical		X			
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X				
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X				
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	X				
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
		X			

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Pupil Achievement (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

2015-16 CAASPP Results for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA	19	19	35	39	44	48
Math	14	20	28	30	34	36

* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

CAASPP Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison									
Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	13-14	14-15	15-16	13-14	14-15	15-16	13-14	14-15	15-16
Science	20	18	19	53	47	47	60	56	54

* Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Grade Level	2015-16 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
5	20.4	24.7	26.9

* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

**2015-16 CAASPP Results by Student Group
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)**

Group	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
	Enrolled	with Valid Scores	w/ Valid Scores	Proficient or Advanced
All Students	100	95	95.0	19.0
Male	45	42	93.3	21.4
Female	55	53	96.4	17.0
Asian	26	25	96.2	20.0
Hispanic or Latino	53	50	94.3	20.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	86	82	95.4	15.9
English Learners	45	44	97.8	2.3

* Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The "Proficient or Advanced" is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

**School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	3	111	108	97.3	13.9
	4	91	84	92.3	20.2
	5	99	96	97.0	22.9
	6	85	84	98.8	20.2
Male	3	55	53	96.4	9.4
	4	44	42	95.5	16.7
	5	44	42	95.5	16.7
	6	50	50	100.0	12.0
Female	3	56	55	98.2	18.2
	4	47	42	89.4	23.8
	5	55	54	98.2	27.8
	6	35	34	97.1	32.4
Black or African American	3	12	12	100.0	8.3
	6	11	11	100.0	
Asian	3	20	19	95.0	15.8
	4	21	19	90.5	26.3
	5	26	25	96.2	28.0
	6	20	20	100.0	35.0
Hispanic or Latino	3	59	57	96.6	17.5
	4	55	52	94.5	17.3
	5	52	50	96.2	22.0
	6	43	43	100.0	18.6

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	98	96	98.0	11.5
	4	76	71	93.4	15.5
	5	85	83	97.7	22.9
	6	76	75	98.7	17.3
English Learners	3	48	46	95.8	10.9
	4	44	41	93.2	7.3
	5	44	44	100.0	11.4
	6	39	39	100.0	5.1
Students with Disabilities	3	12	11	91.7	
	4	14	14	100.0	
	6	11	11	100.0	

ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments. Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	3	111	108	97.3	18.5
	4	91	85	93.4	27.1
	5	100	97	97.0	15.6
	6	85	84	98.8	20.2
Male	3	55	53	96.4	18.9
	4	44	42	95.5	33.3
	5	45	43	95.6	18.6
	6	50	50	100.0	20.0
Female	3	56	55	98.2	18.2
	4	47	43	91.5	20.9
	5	55	54	98.2	13.2
	6	35	34	97.1	20.6
Black or African American	3	12	12	100.0	8.3
	6	11	11	100.0	9.1
Asian	3	20	19	95.0	15.8
	4	21	19	90.5	42.1
	5	26	25	96.2	24.0
	6	20	20	100.0	40.0

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
Hispanic or Latino	3	59	57	96.6	22.8
	4	55	53	96.4	24.5
	5	53	51	96.2	16.0
	6	43	43	100.0	16.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	98	96	98.0	15.6
	4	76	72	94.7	23.6
	5	86	84	97.7	13.3
	6	76	75	98.7	16.0
English Learners	3	48	46	95.8	10.9
	4	44	42	95.5	21.4
	5	45	45	100.0	9.1
	6	39	39	100.0	
Students with Disabilities	3	12	11	91.7	
	4	14	14	100.0	
	6	11	11	100.0	

Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments. Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Parental Involvement State Priority (Priority 3):

- Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each schoolsite.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)

Current opportunities for parent involvement include:

- attendance at parent conferences, Back to School Night, Open House, and monthly Parent Coffee Workshops
- classroom support;
- materials preparation;
- participation in parent/teacher partnerships
- field trip chaperoning;
- attendance and volunteer opportunities for Annual Science Fair and academic Family Nights;
- attendance and leadership of School Site Council and English Language Advisory Committee;
- attendance and participation at Healthy Start parent meetings, trainings, and events;
- participation in CBET classes and kindergarten readiness activities.

For more information, contact Tara L. Lampkins, Principal at (916) 433-5089.

State Priority: School Climate

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the School Climate State Priority (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

School Safety Plan

Sacramento City Unified School District
 Comprehensive Safe School Plan 2016-2017

- Section 1..... Crisis Communication Flow
- Section 2.....Emergency Plan: Site Level Drill and Emergency Procedures
 - (a) Lockdown Response
 - (b) Fire
 - (c) Bomb Threat, ATF Bomb Threat Checklist
 - (d) Active Shooter
 - (e) Chemical
- Section 3.....Emergency Plan: Earthquake Emergency Procedures
- Section 4..... Emergency Plan: Site Level Use of Schools as a Community Shelter **
- Section 5.....District Policies Related to Safety:
 - (a) Board Policy 5021: Custodial & Parent Rights
 - (b) Mandated Child Abuse Reporting
 - (c) Missing Student Protocol
 - (d) Suicide Risk Assessment
- Section 6.....Bullying Policies and Procedures
- Section 7.....Dangerous Student Notification
- Section 8.....Wellness Plan
- Section 9.....District Handbook
- Section 10.....Component I: Social Climate
 Component II: Physical Climate/Campus
- Section 11..... Emergency Plan: Site Level Incident Command System
- Section 12..... Emergency Plan: Site Level Communication Procedures
- Section 13.....Before and After School Programs - Coordinators and Contact Numbers / Days and Hours of Operation on campus
- Section 14.....Emergency Plan: Site Level Safe Ingress & Egress Procedures
- Section 15... Emergency Plan: Site Level Family Reunification Procedures
- Section 16..... Emergency Plan: Site Level Provisions for Students/Staff with Special Needs
- Section 17.....School Site Safety Committee Member List, Approval of CSSP
- Section 18.....Staff Handbook
- Section 19.....Site Specific Documents (option to add documents)

** Once designated by the Red Cross or Office of Emergency Services, the school sites will be notified and Documentation will be inserted in this section.

The Comprehensive Safe School Plans for the Sacramento City Unified School District were revised to ensure the contents of the plans were uniform and updated to address the components set forth in Section 32262 of the 2016 California Education Code. This plan is a work in progress as the Safe Schools Office and the Sacramento Police Department continue to seek the most current information and advice from subject matter experts.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	0.0	6.7	0.3
Expulsions Rate	5.3	0.0	0.0
District	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	4.9	6.1	5.8
Expulsions Rate	0.0	0.0	0.0
State	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1

D. Other SARC Information

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

2016-17 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2006-2007	2008-2009
Year in Program Improvement	Year 5	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	52	
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	76.5	

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	0.0000
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0.0000
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0.0000
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.0000
Psychologist	0.0000
Social Worker	0.0000
Nurse	0.0000
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.0000
Resource Specialist	2.2000
Other	0.0000
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	0.0

* One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)												
Grade	Average Class Size			Number of Classrooms*								
				1-20			21-32			33+		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
K	30	28	27				3	5	2	1		
1	28	28	23			2	4	4	1			
2	31	27	26				2	4	4	1		
3	28	29	26				4	3	4			
4	34	32	28					2	4	3	1	1
5	33	33	32				1	1	3	2	2	2
6	29	172	27				4		1		4	4

Professional Development provided for Teachers

To realize the vision of Sacramento City Unified School District, which is to fully prepare all students for college career and life, it is imperative that the district provides numerous opportunities to expand the professional repertoire of its administrators and teachers.

To that end, the district has crafted a high quality professional program that is focused on the ELA and math Common Core State Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards, English Language Learners, Balanced Literacy and Instructional Strategies for Addressing the Needs of Diverse Learners. These areas of focus were derived from needs assessments coupled with the analysis of student learning of specific content and that is ongoing with follow-up opportunities, models effective practices, and uses assessments to guide and monitor progress. The learning opportunities afforded through this program deeply align with the needs of our individual schools, as well as our strategic plan, and connect to every aspect of school practice: thinking curriculum, intentional instructional practices, assessment for learning, and lesson design.

These learning experiences, which are offered during the school day and after-school are supported with on-site coaching, are in addition to the required 18-hours of professional development designated for teachers to engage in collaborative professional learning at their respective school sites. Such communities of practices, under the leadership and guidance of site administrators, afford our teachers the opportunity to deepen their content knowledge, strengthen their instructional repertoire, improve their assessment strategies, and foster a shared sense of responsibility. As a result, every teacher will help to promote and nurture a community of learners in which the individual school staff is not only enriched, but the district as a whole is enhanced.

To that end, the district has crafted a high quality professional program that is focused on ELA Common Core State Standards, Math Common Core State Standards, English Language Learners, Balanced Literacy and Instructional Strategies for Addressing the Needs of Diverse Learners. These areas of focus were derived from needs assessments coupled with the analysis of student learning of specific content and that is ongoing with follow-up opportunities, models effective practices, and uses assessments to guide and monitor progress. The learning opportunities afforded through this program deeply align with the needs of our individual schools, as well as our strategic plan, and connect to every aspect of school practice: thinking curriculum, intentional instructional practices, assessment for learning, and lesson design.

These learning experiences, which are offered during the school day and after-school are supported with on-site coaching, are in addition to the required 18-hours of professional development designated for teachers to engage in collaborative professional learning at their respective school sites. Such communities of practices, under the leadership and guidance of site administrators, afford our teachers the opportunity to deepen their content knowledge, strengthen their instructional repertoire, improve their assessment strategies, and foster a shared sense of responsibility. As a result, every teacher will help to promote and nurture a community of learners in which the individual school staff is not only enriched, but the district as a whole is enhanced.

FY 2014-15 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$40,683	\$45,092
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$53,467	\$71,627
Highest Teacher Salary	\$87,749	\$93,288
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$102,681	\$115,631
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$104,918	\$120,915
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$120,601	\$132,029
Superintendent Salary	\$290,000	\$249,537
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	31%	37%
Administrative Salaries	5%	5%

* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

Types of Services Funded

Each district school receives categorical funding to provide supplemental services to assist students reach grade level proficiency and above, master grade level content standards and successfully graduate from high school. Services throughout the district include:

- Class Size Reduction
- Tutoring
- Supplemental instructional materials and books in mathematics, reading/language arts and ELD
- Extended Day/Year/ Summer school
- After School Enrichment programs
- Access to technology
- MESA Programs
- Parent Education/Family Nights
- Social Services (Healthy Start)
- Student/Family Primary Language Support
- Translation for Home-School Communication
- Counseling (academic and career)
- Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)
- Special Education
- Professional Development
- Support Staff, such as nurses, instructional assistants, parent advisors, and counselors
- Supplemental Education Services
- School Choice

Please check with your child's principal to receive information regarding the services that are specific to your child's school.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

FY 2014-15 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	49*92.4	349.29	4643.1	62458.59
District	♦	♦	\$4,556	\$67,009
State	♦	♦	\$5,677	\$75,837
Percent Difference: School Site/District			1.9	-4.9
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-13.2	-14.4

* Cells with ♦ do not require data.