



James Lick High School

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

David Porter, Principal

porterd@esuhsd.org

<http://jameslick.esuhsd.org/>

2017-18 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2018-19 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
Pattie Cortese
Lan Nguyen

District Administration

Chris D. Funk
Superintendent
Glenn Vander Zee
Assistant Superintendent
Educational Services

Chris Jew
Associate Superintendent
Business Services

Dr. John Rubio
Associate Superintendent
Human Resources

School Description

James Lick High School, founding school of the East Side Union High School District, opened its doors in 1950. The founding principles of the school were to focus on developing young adults to become impactful members of the Alum Rock and San Jose community through the focus on written communication, oral communication, and mathematical thinking and reasoning. While the demographics and times of have change in the past 68 years, the core values and dedication to serving the residents of East San Jose has not. In 2014, James Lick High School became James Lick High School - A New Tech School. James Lick is now part of a nationally recognized educational philosophy focused on preparing students for 21st century careers through the consistent focus around four major pillars: Communication, Collaboration, Agency and Growth Mindset. These pillars build on the founding members goals and aspirations.

Mission

The staff of James Lick High School – a New Tech School, empower students to own their futures through the application of skills and knowledge to solve real world problems

Vision

Every student who attends James Lick High School – a New Tech School graduates with the skills and knowledge to positively impact their community through their success in college and career

Driving Question

Individually we can dramatically impact a student's life, what will the result be for our community if we align our individual efforts to support a shared goal?

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 <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF web page at <https://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.

2017-18 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 9	269
Grade 10	295
Grade 11	287
Grade 12	248
Total Enrollment	1,099

2017-18 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	2.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5
Asian	6.5
Filipino	6.9
Hispanic or Latino	79.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.7
White	3.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	86.3
English Learners	20.3
Students with Disabilities	15.4
Foster Youth	0.4

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Basic (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	16-17	17-18	18-19
With Full Credential	57	48.833	50.233
Without Full Credential	5.3	3	4
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
East Side Union High School District	16-17	17-18	18-19
With Full Credential	◆	◆	991.5
Without Full Credential	◆	◆	50.6
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	◆	◆	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
James Lick High School	16-17	17-18	18-19
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	2	2	0

* Note: "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.

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2018-19)

In addition to the classroom textbooks, each student has access to a Chromebook in every classroom. In the cases where technology is required at home, students can check out a Chromebook and a new community wireless program was put in place in the fall of 2017 providing free wifi to any student in the James Lick High School Boundary.

Textbooks and Instructional Materials Year and month in which data were collected: October 2018	
Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts	English 1 – “The Language of Literature” Grade 9 McDougal Littell 2002 English 2 – “The Language of Literature” Grade 10 McDougal Littell 2002 English 3 – MyPerspectives: American Literature//Pearson ERWC (English 4)-- Expository Reading and Writing Course Student Reader 2013 AP Composition and Language-- The Norton Reader AP Composition and Literature--The Intro to Literature The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
Mathematics	CCSS Math 1 – "Big Ideas Integrated Mathematics I," Big Ideas Learning, LLC 2016 CCSS Math 2 – "Big Ideas Integrated Mathematics II," Big Ideas Learning, LLC 2016 CCSS Math 3 – "Big Ideas Integrated Mathematics III," Big Ideas Learning, LLC 2016 Math Analysis – “Precalculus With Limits A Graphing Approach” Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning 2012 AP Calculus AB - Calculus w/Analytic Geometry, 9th ed: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2010 Exploring Computer Science - ECS: Exploring Computer Science; Joanna Goode, Gail Chapman 2016 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
Science	Physiology- Holes Essentials of Anatomy and Physiology, McGraw Hill, 2002 Biology – NGSS Biology - The Living Earth -- STEMscopes, eTextbook and Web-based resources Chemistry – “Chemistry” Merrill/Glencoe 1998 Physics- Conceptual Physics, Hewitt AP Chemistry- Chemistry The Central Science- Prentice-Hall 1991 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%
History-Social Science	World History – “Modern World History” McDougal-Littell 2003 US History – “The American Vision” Glencoe/McGraw Hill 2006 American Government – "Government Alive! Power, Politics and You" TCI 2014 Economics – “Econ Alive! The Power to Choose" TCI 2015 AP World History - "The Earth and Its Peoples AP Edition" Cengage Learning 2018 AP US History - "America's History for the AP Course" Bedford 2014 AP Government - "Government in America" Pearson Learning 2014 AP Macro/Micro Economics - "Economics (AP)" McGraw Hill 2014 AP Human Geography - "The Cultural Landscape: An Introduction" Prentice Hall 2014 AP Psychology - "Psychology for AP" Worth 2015 World Geography - "Geography Alive!" TCI 2011 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0%

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

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, 2014, 2015, 2016 and again in 2016-17. James Lick benefits from recently remodeled kitchen facilities, locker rooms, the 100, 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 swimming pool, weight room, Comet Studio and 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: 6/22/18		
System Inspected	Repair Status	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	Good	
Interior: Interior Surfaces	Good	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	Good	
Electrical: Electrical	Good	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	Good	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	Good	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	Good	Building 800 / 900 is currently being remodeled completion due fall 2018
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	Good	
Overall Rating	Exemplary	

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. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAAs items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with the most 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

2017-18 CAASPP Results for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	16-17	17-18	16-17	17-18	16-17	17-18
ELA	58.0	53.0	63.0	59.0	48.0	50.0
Math	22.0	18.0	39.0	38.0	37.0	38.0

Note: 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.

Note: ELA and 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 (i.e., achieved Level 3–Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)					
	School		District		State	
	16-17	17-18	16-17	17-18	16-17	17-18
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

Note: The 2016–17 and 2017–18 data are not available. The CDE is developing a new science assessment based on the Next Generation Science Standards for California Public Schools (CA NGSS). The CAST was pilot-tested in spring 2017 and field-tested in spring 2018. The CAST will be administered operationally during the 2018–19 school year. The CAA for Science was pilot-tested for two years (i.e., 2016–17 and 2017–18) and the CAA for Science will be field-tested in 2018–19.

Note: Science test results include the CAST and the CAA for Science. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the CAST plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3–Alternate) on the CAA for Science divided by the total number of students who participated on both assessments.

State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Other Pupil Outcomes (Priority 8):

- Pupil outcomes in the subject area of physical education

Grade Level	2017-18 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
9	16.8	30.0	42.0

* 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.

**School Year 2017-18 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
All Students	257	242	94.16	53.31
Male	144	133	92.36	44.36
Female	113	109	96.46	64.22
Black or African American	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--
Asian	15	15	100.00	60.00
Filipino	--	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	210	196	93.33	52.04
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	198	184	92.93	53.80
English Learners	60	54	90.00	16.67
Students with Disabilities	34	30	88.24	6.67
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	--	--	--	--
Foster Youth	--	--	--	--

Note: 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 (i.e., achieved Level 3–Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: 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.

Note: 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 2017-18 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
All Students	258	242	93.8	18.18
Male	144	133	92.36	16.54
Female	114	109	95.61	20.18
Black or African American	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--
Asian	15	15	100	53.33
Filipino	11	10	90.91	40
Hispanic or Latino	210	196	93.33	13.78
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	199	184	92.46	17.39
English Learners	60	54	90	3.7
Students with Disabilities	35	29	82.86	0
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	--	--	--	--
Foster Youth	--	--	--	--

Note: 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 (i.e., achieved Level 3--Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: 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.

Note: 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 State priority: Parental Involvement (Priority 3):

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

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2018-19)

The James Lick Community is made up of Students, Staff, and Parents. The parents of James Lick students have many opportunities to get involved with the school. Parents can start with attending the bi-monthly coffee talks or dessert discussions, hosted by the Principal and Parent and Community Specialist. The Parent Specialist also provides ongoing training around grading, technology, and community issues. Parents can serve in an advisory role as a member of the School Site Council, English Language Advisory Committee, James Lick Safety Committee, or the bond oversight committee. James Lick also offers a multitude of volunteer activities from helping with school activities, student project expos, Advanced Placement exams, outreach and parent to parent trainings. Parents wanting more information about these opportunities can reach out to Marcela Parrilla, the Parent and Community Specialist.

State Priority: School Climate

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: School Climate (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 2018.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Suspensions Rate	2.9	7.6	7.2
Expulsions Rate	0.0	0.0	0.2
District	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Suspensions Rate	3.8	4.0	3.7
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1
State	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Suspensions Rate	3.7	3.7	3.5
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.

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	4
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.5
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0
Psychologist	0
Social Worker	1
Nurse	0
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	0
Other	0
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	274.75

* 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 (Secondary)												
Subject	Average Class Size			Number of Classrooms*								
				1-22			23-32			33+		
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
English	27.0	26.0	26.0	7	14	8	38	31	39		2	
Mathematics	29.0	20.0	25.0	1	4	6	7	4	36	5	1	
Science	27.0	24.0	28.0	3	13	4	34	27	30	1	1	1
Social Science	28.0	29.0	27.0	4	3	5	27	23	31	2	7	

* 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.

Professional Development provided for Teachers

2018-2019 Professional Development Plan

Yearlong Focus:

The "Ask"

The Ask is our year-long focus on identifying three high level strategies to evaluate how students are interacting with PBL/PrBL in each of their classes. The Ask is part of our renewed focus on providing non-evaluative, constructive, and timely feedback for teachers in order to improve our practice. The professional development time during the year will utilize the best practices within our building and share those experiences with the staff. Having a limited staff focus will result in more impactful academic changes and will allow space and time for development of a richer and more intentional school culture.

The decision to focus on Driving Questions, Knows/Need to Knows, and Rubrics was decided on the basis that these are three high impact strategies that also speak to the three phases of PBL.

The mechanisms for evaluating the success of these three foci will be the instructional round tool. The primary action will be centered on students being asked about all or any of the three areas of the Ask. The results of these conversations will be shared with the teacher, immediately.

Staff Structures/Groups: Teachers receive specialized Professional Development based on what type of teaching structure they are working in

Singletons - Teachers teaching a single subject, but fully implementing PBL and/or PrBL in the classroom (this would be all teachers)

Cohorts - Singleton teachers working together in groups of 2-4 for a limited period of time on a combined project. Teachers who teach during the same period would meet to develop and implement a project. During the implementation of the project, the teachers would bring the classes together for project development, review and final demonstration.

Single Class Co-Teaching - this has two aspects:

o SPED Co-Teaching - A SPED teacher and a mainstream teacher would combine to teach a single subject with 29 students. The population of the class would be made up of students who have IEPs and mainstream students. This would serve as a experimental ground for developing scaffolding techniques for struggling students. An additive bonus is that it provides a middle step for SPED students who are not ready for an interdisciplinary course but a singleton basic course would not serve their needs

o Single Period Co-Teaching - two teachers who want to combine two subjects for a single period. An example of this would be our current Spanish 3/Spanish for Heritage Speakers course. Other possible examples could be a Yearbook-Multimedia 2/3 course. While the teachers would co-teach the course and plan together, the grading would be separate.

- Interdisciplinary Courses - made up of two or three teachers teaching two subjects. The goal would be offer as many of these courses as possible but based on a balance between teacher desire and student need - resulting in an oscillating number of interdisciplinary courses each year.

PD Support for Teacher Groups

FY 2016-17 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$55,349	\$50,747
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$90,881	\$86,127
Highest Teacher Salary	\$112,154	\$106,915
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$0	
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$0	\$136,636
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$146,943	\$150,286
Superintendent Salary	\$286,275	\$238,058
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	34.0	34.0
Administrative Salaries	4.0	5.0

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

FY 2016-17 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	\$10,455	\$1,656	\$8,799	\$84,232
District	◆	◆	\$7,376	\$89,332
State	◆	◆	\$7,125	\$85,815
Percent Difference: School Site/District			17.6	-3.6
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			28.9	1.8

* Cells with ◆ do not require data.

The California Department of Education issued guidance to LEAs on August 1, 2018, regarding how to calculate school-level per-pupil expenditures that will be reported on 2018-19 report cards.

Types of Services Funded

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 and sophomores who are below grade level. 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 and sophomore level regularly participate in the design and implementation of the English curriculum and tie support directly to the daily tasks.

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate (Four-Year Cohort Rate)			
James Lick High School	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Dropout Rate	20.0	12.9	12.1
Graduation Rate	76.1	84.5	81.9
East Side Union High School District	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Dropout Rate	11.7	10.0	20.5
Graduation Rate	83.0	85.0	71.5
California	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Dropout Rate	10.7	9.7	9.1
Graduation Rate	82.3	83.8	82.7

Career Technical Education Participation	
Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	82
% 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

Courses for University of California (UC) and/or California State University (CSU) Admission	
UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
2017-18 Students Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	98.4
2016-17 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	30.4

* Where there are student course enrollments.

2017-18 Advanced Placement Courses		
Subject	Number of AP Courses Offered*	Percent of Students in AP Courses
Computer Science	0	♦
English	1	♦
Fine and Performing Arts	2	♦
Foreign Language	7	♦
Mathematics	1	♦
Science	4	♦
Social Science	7	♦
All courses	22	34.2

Completion of High School Graduation Requirements			
Group	Graduating Class of 2017		
	School	District	State
All Students	79.6	84.1	88.7
Black or African American	75.0	75.3	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	82.8
Asian	91.3	95.0	94.9
Filipino	87.5	92.2	93.5
Hispanic or Latino	76.7	76.3	86.5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	100.0	67.7	88.6
White	100.0	92.7	92.1
Two or More Races	100.0	89.2	91.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	81.7	83.8	88.6
English Learners	70.7	62.3	56.7
Students with Disabilities	59.4	62.0	67.1
Foster Youth	0.0	59.3	74.1

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.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest web page at <https://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.