

Piedmont Hills High School

1377 Piedmont Rd. • San Jose, CA, 95132 • 408.347.3800 • Grades 9-12

Traci Williams, Principal
williamst@esuhsd.org

2013-14 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2014-15 School Year

East Side Union High School District

830 N. Capitol Avenue
San Jose, CA 95133
(408) 347-5000
www.esuhsd.org

District Governing Board

Frank Biehl

J. Manuel Herrera

Van Thi Le

Magdalena Carrasco

Lan Nguyen

District Administration

Chris D. Funk
Superintendent

Juan Cruz
**Associate Superintendent
Educational Services**

Marcus Battle
**Associate Superintendent
Business Services**

Cari Vaeth
**Associate Superintendent
Human Resources**

School Description

Welcome to Piedmont Hills High School, home of the Pirates. Here you will find teachers, students, parents and administration working together to ensure the best learning environment for all students. Students are enrolled in courses to prepare them to attend four-year colleges and universities around the country. Challenging and rigorous curriculum is enriched by a variety of athletic teams, student clubs and community service organizations. The school offers AP courses in Spanish, French, European History, World History, US History, American Government, Micro Economics, Macro Economics, English Language, English Literature, Biology, Physics, Calculus AB and BC, and Statistics. The performing arts department curriculum includes drama, choir, orchestra, jazz band, and advanced band. World languages include Vietnamese, French, Spanish and Chinese. A well rounded, comprehensive, high school experience is waiting for each and every student.

About the SARC

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. 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 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/>.
- View this SARC online at the school and/or LEA Web sites.
- 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 and community members should contact the school at 408.347.3800.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Grade Level	Number of Students
Gr. 9	555
Gr. 10	554
Gr. 11	553
Gr. 12	544
Total	2,206

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.3
Asian	51.5
Filipino	9.7
Hispanic or Latino	23.1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.4
White	7.5
Two or More Races	4.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	29.6
English Learners	5.8
Students with Disabilities	8.0

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

Piedmont Hills High School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	84.8	92	86
Without Full Credential	.8	0	3
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	92	0
East Side Union High School District	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	◆	◆	949
Without Full Credential	◆	◆	32
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	◆	◆	5

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School

Piedmont Hills High School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	1	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

2013-14 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	98.66	1.34
Districtwide		
All Schools	96.57	3.43
High-Poverty Schools	95.73	4.27
Low-Poverty Schools	98.84	1.16

* 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 2014-15)

Textbooks and Instructional Materials

Year and month in which data were collected: September 2014

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
<p>Reading/Language Arts</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>English 1 – “The Language of Literature” Grade 9 McDougal Littell 2002</p> <p>English 2 – “The Language of Literature” Grade 10 McDougal Littell 2002</p> <p>English 3 – “Timeless Voices Timeless Themes Am. Experience” Prentice Hall 2000</p> <p>ERWC (English 4)-- Expository Reading and Writing Course Student Reader</p>
<p>Mathematics</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Mathematics Vision Project, Secondary Math 1, 2012</p> <p>Geometry – “Geometry” McDougal Littell 2007</p> <p>Algebra II – “Algebra 2” McDougal Littell 2007</p> <p>Math Analysis – “Precalculus With Limits A Graphing Approach” Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning 2012</p>
<p>Science</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Integrated Science 1 – “Spectrum Physical Approach/Science/Explorations” Holt 2001, 03, 04</p> <p>Biology – “Biology” Holt 2004</p> <p>“Chemistry Connections to Our Changing World” Prentice Hall 2003</p> <p>Physics – “Conceptual Physics” Addison-Wesley 1992, 99, 02, 06</p>
<p>History-Social Science</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>World History – “Modern World History” McDougal-Littell 2003</p> <p>US History – “The American Vision” Glencoe 2006</p> <p>American Government – “Magruder’s American Government” Prentice Hall 1997</p> <p>American Government – “We the People” Center for Civic Education 2002</p> <p>Economics – “Holt Economics” Holt 2003</p>
<p>Foreign Language</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and officially adopted</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and officially adopted</p>
<p>Visual and Performing Arts</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and officially adopted</p>
<p>Science Laboratory Equipment</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%</p>	<p>Science labs are adequately equipped</p>

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Overview

The District makes every effort to ensure that all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the district uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. The results of this survey are available at the school office and at the district office.

Cleaning Process and Schedule

The district’s Board of Trustees has adopted cleaning standards for all schools in the district. The Leadership Team works daily with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school.

Deferred Maintenance Budget

The district participates in the State School Deferred Maintenance Program, which provides state matching funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis, to assist school districts with expenditures for major repair or replacement of existing school building components. Typically, this includes roofing, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, interior or exterior painting, and floors systems.

Age Of School Buildings

Although the main school campus was constructed in 1966, portable buildings have been added to accommodate modernization as well as science, special education, and mathematics classes.

Modernization Projects

Physical Education restroom modernization was completed in August 2008.
 The softball field renovation was completed April 2010.
 Solar panel installation in the student parking lot was completed by March 2011.
 Campus wide painting project – completed August 2012
 The new auxiliary gym completed July 2013.
 Track resurfacing completed August 2013.
 Main Gym bleacher and floor replacement completed August 2013.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
 Year and month in which data were collected: July 2014

System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[X]	[]	[]	Bld D31 Portable CR: thermostat blowing hot air only-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
Interior: Interior Surfaces	[X]	[]	[]	Bld F: item noted but no details provided-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]	Baseball Complex North and Bld C Kitchen: no details noted-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld P16 Portable CR: wall covers ripped off-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Field Complex (Baseball South, Soccer, Softball): dead trees along fences-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Landscape/Hardscape: item noted but no details-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Softball Complex North: ground squirrel infestation-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Stadium East & West: item noted but no details-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]	No items noted
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]	Swimming Pool Complex: item noted but no details-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]	No items noted.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
Year and month in which data were collected: July 2014

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[]	[]	[X]		Bld D26, 27, 28, Portable CR Science: siding rotten heavy-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld D29 & 31 Portable CR: ramp needs repair-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld H Locker Rm Girls : crack on floor and wall-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld J Locker Rm Boys: cracks on floor-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld I Gymnasium: cracks on ceiling above backboard harness-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld M Gymnasium Auxillary: item noted but no details.-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Bld P6 Portable CR: ramp rot and ripped wall paper-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[]	[]		Bld D26, 27, 28, Portable CR Science: back door needs repair-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair. Tennis Courts: courts need repairing also some bars on the fences. Seats on bleachers need repair. No windbreaker nets.-Action/plan-Site to submit work order and M&O to schedule repair.
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
	[]	[]	[X]	[]	

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);
- The Academic Performance Index; and
- The percentage of pupils 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.

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		
	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14
Science	66	66	70	52	52	53	60	59	60

* Science (grades 5, 8, and 10) assessments include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). 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.

STAR 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		
	10-11	11-12	12-13	10-11	11-12	12-13	10-11	11-12	12-13
ELA	65	64	67	49	50	52	54	56	55
Math	42	43	40	30	29	28	49	50	50
HSS	66	61	65	43	43	45	48	49	49

* STAR Program was last administered in 2012-13. 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.

Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

API Rank	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Statewide	9	8	9
Similar Schools	5	4	4

* For 2014 and subsequent years, the statewide and similar schools ranks will no longer be produced.

Grade Level

Grade Level	2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
9	6.0	27.7	62.1

* 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.

2013-14 CAASPP Results by Student Group

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
	Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)
All Students in the LEA	53
All Student at the School	70
Male	72
Female	69
Black or African American	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	86
Filipino	77
Hispanic or Latino	40
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
White	64
Two or More Races	65
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	58
English Learners	12
Students with Disabilities	32
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	

* CAASPP includes science assessments (CSTs, CMA, and CAPA) in grades 5, 8, and 10. 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.

API Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

Group	Actual API Change		
	10-11	11-12	12-13
All Students at the School	21	-10	11
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian	22	-5	3
Filipino	12	8	24
Hispanic or Latino	12	-19	9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	52	-25	-11
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	9	-15	18
English Learners	18	28	-35
Students with Disabilities			35

* "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

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

Our goal is to create an environment of parent awareness that will honor the wonderful ethnic and linguistic diversity that reflects the students of Piedmont Hills. The school has an active school site council and parent booster clubs. The school uses of School Loop and Teleparent to effectively communicate with parent and students.

Contact Person: Sharlisa Byrd (408) 347-3842

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

With the implementation of SB 187 all schools in the ESUHSD are required to write and annually review the school's comprehensive safety plan. In addition to the process for the annual review of safety plans, SB 187 identifies the essential elements of a comprehensive school safety plan. These elements include a site-based assessment of the current status of school safety issues, school crime and appropriate strategies and programs that will provide or maintain a high level of school safety. Piedmont Hills' Comprehensive Safety Plan was reviewed and updated last spring and has been approved by the School Site Council and the ESUHSD Board of Education. The entire plan is posted on the school web site. Piedmont Hills endeavors to provide a safe, clean and comfortable learning environment for its students.

The campus is monitored throughout the day by school administration, campus monitor, advisors, San Jose Police Officer and several teachers who serve on the safety team. Monthly community partnership safety meeting are held with advisors, the APA, campus monitor, and staff from nearby feeder schools to discuss safety issues which may impact our school communities. The school safety team is comprised of the APA, advisors, campus monitor, teachers, students, and parents and meets to discuss campus safety issues. Piedmont Hills High School is a closed campus and all visitors must check in at the administration building and receive a visitors badge before entering campus.

Suspensions and Expulsions

School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	3.4	2.1	1.5
Expulsions Rate	0.2	0.0	0.0
District	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	5.4	4.2	4.5
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1
State	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	5.7	5.1	4.4
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1

* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment x 100.

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.

2013-14 Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria		
AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall	No	No
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts	Yes	No
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts	No	No
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics	No	No
Met API Criteria	Yes	Yes

2014-15 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement		Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		16
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		84.2

* DW (determination waiver) indicates that the PI status of the school was carried over from the prior year in accordance with the flexibility granted through the federal waiver process.

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	3.0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.25
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1
Psychologist	0
Social Worker	1
Nurse	0
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1
Resource Specialist	0
Other	0
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	736

* 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												
Average Class Size				Number of Classrooms*								
				1-20			21-32			33+		
Grade	12	13	14	12	13	14	12	13	14	12	13	14
English	30.4	28	29	8	13	11	29	36	24	40	36	46
Math	30.6	29	30	10	14	13	10	15	14	41	46	45
Science	33.3	30	30	3	11	11	7	7	11	48	52	51
SS	32.8	27	29	3	17	10	6	13	20	29	45	39

* Number of classes indicates how many classrooms fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom). At the secondary school level, this information is reported by subject area rather than grade level.

FY 2012-13 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$47,104	\$42,957
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$74,444	\$69,613
Highest Teacher Salary	\$95,445	\$89,407
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$0	
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$0	\$120,526
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$128,614	\$129,506
Superintendent Salary	\$235,000	\$207,044
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	39	37
Administrative Salaries	4	5

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

FY 2012-13 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	\$6,230	\$1,213	\$5,017	\$78,987
District	♦	♦	\$5,722	\$76,437
State	♦	♦	\$4,690	\$72,276
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-12.3	1.6
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-9.4	10.3

Types of Services Funded at Piedmont Hills High School

Piedmont Hills receives minimal funding from state and federal programs to provide additional assistance to our students. The school utilizes facility rental income to fund additional interventions and support to students such as tutoring and summer school recovery classes.

Professional Development provided for Teachers at Piedmont Hills High School

Professional development opportunities for staff members are multifaceted and clearly and consistently linked to the state's standards, district goals, the school's core values, and occur during the school year and summer break. Our school has a coherent, comprehensive plan for professional development that is data driven and directly linked to teaching and learning. Not only do teachers and staff participate in staff development opportunities at the school, but they also take advantage of multiple professional development opportunities at the District. In addition, many teachers take professional growth classes at local colleges and universities and attend workshops offered by the Santa Clara County Office of Education. BTSAs and new teacher orientation meetings support new instructors. The school has created and successfully implemented a collaboration model for professional development. School wide and departmental meetings are held regularly so that teachers can continue to work on professional development to support school-wide efforts to align curriculum with rigorous state content standards as well as to provide instructional support for literacy and differentiation to assure the achievement of all students.

To ensure a cycle of continuous improvement, professional development is personalized to address the needs of all subject-area teachers, staff, and administrators. Not only do professional development activities for teachers reflect a best practices approach, but they also align with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Teachers and staff participate in professional development that is aligned with their individual fields and district plans at multiple levels. At the school level, professional development is structured to have a generalized focus (e.g., standards-based instruction), and specific facets of the professional development program (e.g., specific instructional strategies) are personalized to address the specific content area dynamics and needs. For example, in English, teachers are examining student work to ascertain effective standards-based instructional strategies, while in Physical Education, teachers are reviewing the FitnessGram data to establish effective instruction strategies for physical fitness instruction. The district also offers a multitude of professional development opportunities to broaden teachers' knowledge, enhance their classroom management skills, and augment their repertoire of best practices instructional strategies.

2013-14 California High School Exit Examination Grade Ten Results by Student Group

Group	English-Language Arts			Mathematics		
	Not Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Not Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
All Students in the LEA	45	23	32	38	33	30
All Students at the School	24	29	47	26	28	46
Male	27	31	42	24	29	47
Female	22	26	52	28	27	45
Black or African American	18	59	24	40	40	20
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Asian	11	25	64	6	29	65
Filipino	9	49	42	27	33	40
Hispanic or Latino	56	26	18	65	21	13
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander						
White	43	25	32	46	19	35
Two or More Races	26	41	32	26	38	35
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	40	25	35	38	24	38
English Learners	92	8				
Students with Disabilities	100					
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services						

* 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.

CAHSEE Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
Piedmont Hills High School	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
English-Language Arts	68	72	76
Mathematics	73	78	74
East Side Union High School District	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
English-Language Arts	54	56	50
Mathematics	61	63	56
California	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
English-Language Arts	56	57	56
Mathematics	58	60	62

* 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.

Completion of High School Graduation Requirements			
Group	Graduating Class of 2013		
	School	District	State
All Students	94.84	82.21	84.56
Black or African American	100.00	79.72	75.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	50.00	62.96	77.82
Asian	99.29	92.55	92.94
Filipino	88.89	90.53	92.20
Hispanic or Latino	83.72	73.24	80.83
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	100.00	86.67	84.06
White	95.45	88.08	90.15
Two or More Races	0.00	88.46	89.03
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	91.47	75.66	82.58
English Learners	78.95	55.53	53.68
Students with Disabilities	75.76	59.46	60.31

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate			
Piedmont Hills High School	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Dropout Rate (1-year)	5.0	6.3	5.1
Graduation Rate	92.15	91.15	93.03
East Side Union High School District	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Dropout Rate (1-year)	17.4	14.8	13.5
Graduation Rate	77.13	80.11	81.95
California	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Dropout Rate (1-year)	14.7	13.1	11.4
Graduation Rate	77.14	78.87	80.44

2013-14 Advanced Placement Courses		
Subject	Number of AP Courses Offered*	Percent of Students In AP Courses
Computer Science		♦
English	1	♦
Fine and Performing Arts		♦
Foreign Language	2	♦
Mathematics	10	♦
Science	12	♦
Social Science	25	♦
All courses	50	1.0

* Where there are student course enrollments.

Courses for University of California (UC) and/or California State University (CSU) Admission	
UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
2013-14 Enrollment in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	80.62
2012-13 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	54.84

Career Technical Education Participation	
Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	541
% of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	3.4%
% of CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	60%

Career Technical Education Programs

Entrepreneurship Program: Students will graduate from the program with all of the basic skills necessary to start their own business, enter a career in business or get a head start on a college degree.

Program Features

- Four complete state –of –the-art computer labs. Labs are equipped with the latest software, hardware, presentation systems and peripheral equipment
- Professional certification in Microsoft Word, and Microsoft Excel
- Students have the opportunity to participate in a student run business
- Students will learn to use all the following software: Microsoft Office, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe InDesign, Adobe Illustrator, Adobe Dreamweaver, and Adobe Flash
- Courses offered in Accounting, Microsoft Office, Graphic Design, Web Design, Entrepreneurship, Computer Programming
- Students can earn college credit for all Business Magnet courses. (limited to specific schools)

Computer Aided Drafting Design: Students develop pre-engineering skills in using CADD software as well as understanding architectural schematic drawings and floor plans.

Carpentry: Students develop basic carpentry skills using top of the line machinery.