

# James Lick High School

57 North White Rd. • San Jose, CA, 95127 • 408.347.4400 • Grades 9-12

Kelly Daugherty, Principal  
daughertyk@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**

James Lick High School is a small school that has made giant leaps towards student success as measured by state testing, graduation rates, and A-G completion. As of 2014, James Lick joined the New Tech Network. This affiliation will help guide the next round of student success through Project Based Learning, Problem Based Learning and through four key pillars: Agency, Growth Mindset, Collaboration, and Communication. Students experience at least one cross-curricular and team taught course and learn to demonstrate their understanding through authentic (real world) projects.

The vision of James Lick High School is Silicon Valley Success. This vision encapsulates our focus on making the job market in Silicon Valley a reality for our students.

The Mission of James Lick High School is: James Lick students will be effective communicators, creative thinkers, collaborators, and problem solvers

## 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 408.347.4400.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Gr. 9	316
Gr. 10	296
Gr. 11	300
Gr. 12	281
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,193</b>

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6
Asian	6.3
Filipino	6.5
Hispanic or Latino	78.9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.3
White	5.3
Two or More Races	0.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85.2
English Learners	22.0
Students with Disabilities	13.2

## 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			
James Lick High School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	47	56	49
Without Full Credential	3.8	1	4
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	1
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			
James Lick High School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Teachers of English Learners	0	2	2
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	2	3
Vacant Teacher Positions	3	0	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	95.45	4.55
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**

<b>Core Curriculum Area</b>	<b>Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption</b>
<p><b>Reading/Language Arts</b></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><b>Mathematics</b></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” Houghton Mifflin 2001</p>
<p><b>Science</b></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 – Web of Life (ISBN:0201334402) Principles and Explorations (isbn:0030514339)</p> <p>Chemistry – “Chemistry” Merrill/Glencoe 1998</p> <p>Physics – “Physics: Principles and Problems” Merrill/Glencoe 1983, 95, 02</p>
<p><b>History-Social Science</b></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</p> <p>US History – “The American Vision” Glencoe</p> <p>American Government – “Magruder’s American Government” Prentice Hall</p> <p>American Government – “We the People” Center for Civic Education</p> <p>Economics – “Holt Economics” Holt 2003</p>
<p><b>Foreign Language</b></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><b>Health</b></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><b>Visual and Performing Arts</b></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><b>Science Laboratory Equipment</b></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 and Modernization Projects**

James Lick is proud to be the first high school of the East Side Union School District. James Lick honors the history of the site and values the needs of today's students. The main school campus was constructed in 1950. Since that time, various areas of the campus and classrooms have undergone modernization renovations in 1967, 1997, 2005 and again in 2014. James Lick benefits from recently remodeled kitchen facilities, locker rooms, the 200 wing, the 300 wing and Gymnasium. We also have designed and created a new Fire Science Building, a new Child Development Center, and a new building with 8 classrooms and 3 technology spaces. We are in the process of designing and building a new Student Success Center.

**Maintenance Projects**

James Lick has undergone the following ongoing renovations since 1992 to promote a positive learning and teaching environment: Modern campus lighting, exterior and interior that is timed throughout the 24-hour cycle, new doors and hall sections that are in accordance with state and federal fire codes

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

System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	Bld 500: sewer item noted but no details-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 900: sewer, interior surfaces and restroom issues noted- reoccurring plumbing issues in kitchen-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	Bld 600: interior surface noted but no details-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 1200 Gymnasium: in need of new fencing for gym and pool area. Paint chipped on doors to boiler room-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	Bld 200 & Bld 300: pest/vermin infestation noted but no details provided-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	No items noted
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	Bld 500: continuous plumbing issues with restrooms-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 600: missing a toilet from staff restroom due to a plumbing issue that was never finished-Action/plan-Assistant Director of Maintenance to investigate the issue and schedule the repair. Bld Childcare: break room sink is leaking-Work has been completed. Bld Restrm (near Bld 1000): urinal neutralizers are needed for boys' urinals-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	No items noted

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

System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	Bld 100: walkways have water damage and roof has an issue but no details noted-Action/plan-District-wide roofing project that is currently in the design process will address this. Bld 400 classroom 406 & 408: roof damage caused water damage in classrooms-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bldg 500: large water spots on roof 517 & 518-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 600: lots of water damage from roof-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 700: structural damage and roofs noted but no details noted-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 800: animals have burrowed holes into roof which has caused damage to side of building roof-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Bld 1300: structural damage and roof issues due to homeless vandalism problem causes many of these issues-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Covered Walkways: water damage to roof areas throughout school grounds including 100's 600 and 700 walkways-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	Bld 500: gates need to be finished-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work. Field Complex (Baseball, Soccer, Softball): baseball & softball field have draining issues-Action/plan-site to submit work order and M&O to schedule the work.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> [ ]	<b>Good</b> [X]	<b>Fair</b> [ ]	<b>Poor</b> [ ]

## 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	25	28	22	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	36	37	37	49	50	52	54	56	55
Math	14	14	11	30	29	28	49	50	50
HSS	34	29	31	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	3	2	2
Similar Schools	6	3	5

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

#### 2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards

Grade Level	2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
9	7.9	36.0	47.6

\* 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	22
Male	27
Female	17
Black or African American	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	54
Filipino	25
Hispanic or Latino	19
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
White	30
Two or More Races	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	21
English Learners	5
Students with Disabilities	7
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	3	-7	0
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	-5	7	3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-4	5	3
English Learners	-6	30	-26
Students with Disabilities			

\* "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

James Lick seeks to build upon the values of its families and community toward higher academic achievement.

Freshman orientation, regular evening parent meetings at the end of marking periods, frequent teleparent information, early alert for students performing below expectations, and the use of school/home communication technology work to bring about a home/school partnership that is clear in purpose and supportive of learner, educator and parent/guardian. The school has an active School Site Council, English Language Advisory Council and the James Lick Athletic Boosters.

James Lick High School has employed a full time Parent and Community Liaison that has created a Parent and Community Center that serves as a central location for building and maintaining parent and community support.

### 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

James Lick High School provides a safe environment in which student have the comfort and security necessary to pursue their social and academic goals. An Associate Principal, two advisors and a rotating team of teachers maintain a campus ready for students. Beyond an electronic campus supervision that operates around the clock, this security team monitors the campus during school hours. A member of the San Jose Police Department is also on site to support students. The school has also built relationships with many outside service agencies such as, Alum Rock Counseling Center, Starlight, Asian American Recovery Services, and Next Door Solutions.

Visitors are welcomed on campus and are asked to come to the front office for permission to be on campus and to register themselves as visitors.

James Lick has a detailed, comprehensive safety plan that outlines protocols, systems, and procedures in the event of any/all emergencies. This plan also contains the yearly safety goals as determined by the students, staff, and parents. The Safety Plan is developed by the James Lick Safety Committee and reviewed by the District Safety Committee before it is presented to the East Side Union High School District Board of Trustees for adoption. The Safety Plan and drill procedures are reviewed during the year with all staff. Safety alerts are shared with all staff as needed throughout the school year. In addition, all required drills are calendared and completed and the results are communicated to all staff. The safety plan was last reviewed by the Safety Committee on April of 2014.

### Suspensions and Expulsions

School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	6.0	6.1	6.3
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.3
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	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2000-2001	2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement	Year 5	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	2
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.25
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0
Psychologist	0
Social Worker	0
Nurse	0
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0
Resource Specialist	0
Other	0
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	600

\* 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
Other		11			33							
English	27.1	27	27	9	15	12	39	29	30	9	13	10
Math	27.9	27	27	11	17	13	18	14	22	20	18	14
Science	32	30	30	3	4	5	9	16	15	21	15	15
SS	30.2	31	29	6	5	8	7	7	10	24	26	20

\* 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/](http://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	\$8,366	\$2,462	\$5,904	\$70,414
District	♦	♦	\$5,722	\$76,437
State	♦	♦	\$4,690	\$72,276
Percent Difference: School Site/District			3.2	-9.4
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			6.6	-1.6

**Types of Services Funded at James Lick High School**

Categorical funds are directed to assist those learners who perform below grade level in the areas of Language Arts and Mathematics. In class support is provided for freshman who are below grade level and CAHSEE support classes are offered to all other students who are not demonstrating math readiness. Targeted small group writing instruction is provided by a writing coach to Juniors who have not passed the CAHSEE exam. Language Arts coaches routinely meet with teachers to ensure that the instructional program is infused with the strategies necessary to move students toward standards mastery. Language Art Coaches at the Freshmen level regularly participate in the design and implementation of the English curriculum and tie support directly to the daily tasks.

**Professional Development provided for Teachers at James Lick 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. The current professional development plan is centered around the implementation of Project Based Learning and Problem Based Learning since James Lick is now part of the New Tech Network. 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 the Common Core State Standards as well as to provide instructional support for the full implementation of Project and Problem Based Learning.

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 centered around individual implementation of Project Based Learning and Problem Based learning as well as team teaching or cross-curricular teams (eg. Biology - Literature, Math - PE).

Most important, the school has initiated professional development opportunities to bring instructional readiness to a level to help students experience success in the coming Common Core State Standards.

**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	62	21	17	56	32	12
Male	64	19	17	53	37	10
Female	60	23	17	60	25	15
Black or African American						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Asian	38	8	54	17	42	42
Filipino	50	25	25	38	41	21
Hispanic or Latino	68	20	12	63	29	8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander						
White	35	35	30	42	33	25
Two or More Races						
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	66	20	14	58	31	11
English Learners	87	12	1	81	17	2
Students with Disabilities	94	6		94	6	
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			
James Lick High School	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
English-Language Arts	36	44	38
Mathematics	41	44	44
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	73.42	82.21	84.56
Black or African American	50.00	79.72	75.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.00	62.96	77.82
Asian	93.55	92.55	92.94
Filipino	87.50	90.53	92.20
Hispanic or Latino	68.69	73.24	80.83
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	100.00	86.67	84.06
White	82.61	88.08	90.15
Two or More Races	100.00	88.46	89.03
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	75.24	75.66	82.58
English Learners	55.93	55.53	53.68
Students with Disabilities	55.00	59.46	60.31

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate			
<b>James Lick High School</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
Dropout Rate (1-year)	27.7	19.2	16.0
Graduation Rate	68.18	76.95	79.93
<b>East Side Union High School District</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
Dropout Rate (1-year)	17.4	14.8	13.5
Graduation Rate	77.13	80.11	81.95
<b>California</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
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	6	♦
Mathematics	2	♦
Science	2	♦
Social Science	4	♦
<b>All courses</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0.7</b>

\* 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	77.17
2012-13 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	30.77

Career Technical Education Participation	
Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	52
% of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	N/A
% of CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	0

### Career Technical Education Programs

Currently, two groups of students participate in the Fire Service Pathway. An increasing number of students participate in the Silicon Valley Career Technical Education program for vocational readiness. Both our Fire Service Pathway and SVCTE are A-G eligible and count towards college entrance requirements.