

School Accountability Report Card

Reported for School Year 2008-09 Published During 2009-10

The School Accountability Report Card (SARC), which is required by law to be published annually, contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. More information about SARC requirements is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) [SARC](#) Web page. For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

I. Data and Access

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., Academic Performance Index [API], Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, 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 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.

II. About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2009-10)

This section provides the schools contact information.

School		District	
School Name	James Lick High	District Name	East Side Union High
Street	57 North White Rd.	Phone Number	408-347-5000
City, State, Zip	San Jose , CA 95127-1933	Web Site	www.esuhd.org
Phone Number	408-347-4400	Superintendent	Dan Moser
Principal	Glenn Vanderzee	E-mail Address	moserd@esuhsd.org
E-mail Address	vanderzeeg@esuhsd.org	CDS Code	43- 69427- 4333639

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2008-09)

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2008-09)

James Lick is a school on the rise. The recent improvements to the facilities, the upward trend in test scores and the dedication of the staff and students to move forward makes James Lick High School a special place to be. James Lick students are students on the move. The focus of recent reform and the purpose of our continuous efforts for increased academic achievement will be to develop students who have the skills and the learning necessary to pursue the future of their choosing.

Students who move set goals. Students who move monitor their progress to their goals. Students who move have the support and help they need to reach their goals. Students who move celebrate goals met and form new ones. Our entire focus as a staff and a learning community is to ensure that we support students to move through a diploma into future work and study. The ability for us as a small school, comprised of committed educators, to assist students as they move forward, as well as to provide unique and varied opportunities for student leadership and extra-curricular activities, makes being a part of James Lick exciting.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2008-09)

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2008-09)

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, weekly De Padre a Padre weekly workshops, 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.

Contact Person: Glenn Vander Zee, Principal, (408) 347-4400.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the number of students enrolled in each grade level at the school.

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0

Grade 8	0
Ungraded Elementary	0
Grade 9	391
Grade 10	336
Grade 11	288
Grade 12	272
Ungraded Secondary	103
Total Enrollment	1390

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students enrolled at the school who are identified as being in a particular group.

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
African American	2.52 %
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.58 %
Asian	7.19 %
Filipino	6.40 %
Hispanic or Latino	74.60 %
Pacific Islander	0.50 %
White (not Hispanic)	7.91 %
Multiple or No Response	0.29 %
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	46.00 %
English Learners	30.00 %
Students with Disabilities	11.00 %

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

This table displays by subject area the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Subject	2006-07				2007-08				2008-09			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	23.1	27	20	4	24.0	24	29	2	25.7	18	40	4
Mathematics	24.0	18	21	6	27.0	14	17	13	25.6	22	19	12
Science	31.3	2	6	15	29.3	2	25	6	29.1	3	22	8
Social Science	32.0	1	10	11	30.9	1	16	11	29.7	2	23	6

III. School Climate

School Safety Plan (School Year 2008-09)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive 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.

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 2008.

Suspensions and Expulsions

This table displays the rate of suspensions and expulsions (the total number of incidents divided by the total enrollment) at the school and district levels for the most recent three-year period.

Rate	School			District		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Suspensions	36.6	42.9	31.3	21.7	30.0	16.9
Expulsions	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1

IV. School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2009-10)

This section provides information about the condition of the school's grounds, buildings, and restrooms, and a description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements.

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

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 and again in 2005. James Lick benefit from recently remodeled kitchen facilities and locker rooms. Three new building projects are in development to create more options for James Lick students in the future.

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

Modernization Projects

Between the 2005-2009 school years, Measure G funds and state matching funds were used in the ongoing renovation of school facilities. This year, a new Child Development Center will be built. The following year construction efforts will begin for academic wing and the Fire Service training facility.

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school site inspection to determine the school facility's good repair status.

Item Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Gas Leaks	x			
Mechanical Systems	80%	20%		Will replace unit when funds are available.
Windows/Doors/Gates (interior and exterior)	80%		20%	Replacing windows monthly do to vandalism.
Interior Surfaces (walls, floors, and ceilings)	80%	10%	10%	We replaced carpet in 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 315, 316, 317, and 319. We will replace more when funds are available.
Hazardous Materials (interior and exterior)	x			
Structural Damage	x			
Fire Safety	x			
Electrical (interior and exterior)	x			
Pest/Vermin Infestation		x		Have buildings spray by pest control company
Drinking Fountains (inside and outside)		x		We work on drinking fountains three to four times a year
Restrooms	x			Restrooms were remodeled.
Sewer	x			
Playground/School Grounds	x			Tennis courts need resurfacing. Will do when funds are available.

Other Athletic Fields	x			Soccer field needs reseeding will be done when funds are available.
Overall Rating	x			

V. Teachers

Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential, without a full credential, and those teaching outside of their subject area of competence. Detailed information about teacher qualifications can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Teachers	School			District
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09
With Full Credential	51	56	58	1089
Without Full Credential	5	8	11	149
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0	N/A

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester). Note: Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Indicator	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	4	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	4	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Core Academic Classes Taught by No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers in the school, in all schools in the district, in high-poverty schools in the district, and in low-poverty schools in the district. High poverty schools are defined as those schools with student participation of approximately 75 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low poverty schools are those with student participation of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program. More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found on the CDE [Improving Teacher and Principal Quality](#) Web page.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers
This School	88.6	11.4
All Schools in District	95.2	4.8
High-Poverty Schools in District	94.4	5.6
Low-Poverty Schools in District		

VI. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays, in units of full-time equivalents (FTE), the number of academic counselors and other support staff who are assigned to the school and the average number of students per academic counselor. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	2.0	695
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Psychologist		N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse		N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist		N/A
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)		N/A
Other	3.0	

VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays information about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school, and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

CORE CURRICULUM AREA AND TEXTBOOK IN USE BY COURSE	PUBLISHER	YEAR PUBLISHED	PERCENT OF PUPILS WHO LACK THEIR OWN ASSIGNED TEXTBOOKS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS OR SCIENCE LAB EQUIPMENT
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS			
English 1 – “The Language of Literature Ninth Grade”	McDougal Littell	2002	0
English 2 – “The Language of Literature” Grade 10	McDougal Littell	2002	0
English 3 – “Timeless Voices Timeless Themes Am. Experience”	Prentice Hall	2000	0

English 4 – “The Language of Literature” World Literature	McDougal Littell	2002	0
MATH			
Algebra I – “Algebra 1”	McDougal Littell	2007	0
Geometry – “Geometry”	McDougal Littell	2007	0
Algebra II – “Algebra 2”	McDougal Littell	2007	0
Math Analysis – “Precalculus With Limits”	Houghton Mifflin	2001	0
SCIENCE			
Integrated Science 1 – “Spectrum Physical Approach/Science/Explorations”	Holt	2001, 03, 04	0
Biology – “Biology: Principles and Explorations”	Holt	1998	0
Chemistry – “Chemistry: Merrill/Glencoe”	Merrill/Glencoe	1998	0
Physics – “Physics: Principles and Problems”	Merrill/Glencoe	1983, 95, 02	0
SOCIAL SCIENCE			
World History – “Modern World History”	McDougal-Littell	2003	0
US History – “The American Vision”	Glencoe	2006	0
American Government – “Magruder’s American Government”	Prentice Hall	1997	0
American Government – “We the People”	Center for Civic Education	2002	0
CURRICULUM AREA	QUALITY, CURRENCY, AND AVAILABILITY OF TEXTBOOKS AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS		PERCENT OF PUPILS WHO LACK THEIR OWN ASSIGNED TEXTBOOKS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS OR SCIENCE LAB EQUIPMENT
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and officially adopted		0
HEALTH SCIENCES	Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and		0

	officially adopted	
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS	Textbooks and Instructional Materials in use are standards aligned and officially adopted	0
SCIENCE LABORATORY EQUIPMENT	Science labs are adequately equipped	0

VIII. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays a comparison of the school's per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures can be found on the CDE [Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending](#) Web page and teacher salaries can be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$8,241	\$2,623	\$5,618	\$72,590
District	N/A	N/A	\$6,106	\$76,369
Percent Difference – School Site and District	N/A	N/A	-9%	-5%
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,512	\$68,332
Percent Difference – School Site and State	N/A	N/A	2%	6%

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2008-09)

This section provides information about the programs and supplemental services that are available at the school and funded through either categorical or other sources.

Categorical funds are directed to assist those learners who perform below grade level in the areas of Language Arts and Mathematics. CAHSEE support classes are offered to Freshmen and Sophomore students who are more than two years below grade level. One on one, as well as targeted small group writing instruction is provided by a writing coach to Juniors who have not passed the CAHSEE exam. Math and 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. Additional funds are utilized by the YWCA at the site to provide a credit recovery program and homework center.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays district salaries for teachers, principals, and superintendents, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teacher and administrative salaries as a percent of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size based on the salary schedule. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$48,434	\$42,810
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$79,527	\$69,375
Highest Teacher Salary	\$98,141	\$89,104
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)		
Average Principal Salary (Middle)		\$120,314
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$122,625	\$126,901
Superintendent Salary	\$238,000	\$198,563
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	37.90 %	37.30 %
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4.30 %	5.20 %

IX. Student Performance

Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including the California Standards Tests (CSTs); the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CSTs show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. The CSTs include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and ten through eleven. The CAPA includes ELA, mathematics, and science in grades two through eleven, and for science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations. The CMA includes ELA and mathematics for grades three through eight and science in grade five and is an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations. Student scores are reported as performance levels. Detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, can be found on the CDE [Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Results](#) Web site. Program information regarding the STAR Program can be found in the [Explaining 2008 STAR Program Summary Results to the Public guide](#). Note: 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. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the percent of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards).

Subject	School			District			State		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English-Language Arts	23	28	32	43	44	47	43	46	50

Mathematics	5	6	9	23	23	26	40	43	46
Science	14	19	26	37	44	45	38	46	50
History-Social Science	12	15	26	30	34	39	33	36	41

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students, by group, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
African American	28	0	17	21
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	*
Asian	48	43	29	34
Filipino	48	17	53	50
Hispanic or Latino	29	6	21	22
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*
White (not Hispanic)	38	5	57	45
Male	29	11	30	30
Female	36	7	22	21
Economically Disadvantaged	27	10	21	22
English Learners	5	5	8	3
Students with Disabilities	5	1	15	6
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	25	4	*	43

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

California High School Exit Examination Results

The California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) is primarily used as a graduation requirement. However, the grade ten results of this exam are also used to establish the percentages of students at three proficiency levels (not proficient, proficient, or advanced) in ELA and mathematics in order to compute Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) designations as required by the federal NCLB Act of 2001. Detailed information regarding CAHSEE results can be found at the CDE [California High School Exit Examination \(CAHSEE\)](#) Web site. Note: 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. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

California High School Exit Examination Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the percent of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level in ELA and mathematics.

Subject	School			District			State		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English-Language Arts	31.3	43.0	44.0	51.9	55.1	55.1	48.6	52.9	52.0
Mathematics	24.7	34.0	42.7	55.1	59.6	59.6	49.9	51.3	53.3

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

California High School Exit Examination Results by Performance Level for Student Groups – Most Recent Year

This table displays the percent of students, by group, achieving at each performance level in English language-arts and mathematics for the most recent testing period.

Group	English			Mathematics		
	Not Proficient	Proficient	Advanced	Not Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
All Students	57.0	37.5	5.6	66.0	26.1	7.9
Male	57.5	38.8	3.7	65.0	27.0	8.0
Female	56.4	35.9	7.7	67.2	25.0	7.8
African American	*	*	*	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*
Filipino	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	60.7	34.8	4.5	70.4	23.6	5.9
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*
White (not Hispanic)	39.1	52.2	8.7	56.5	39.1	4.3
English Learners	67.4	29.8	2.8	70.6	23.8	5.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	62.4	34.1	3.5	65.9	25.6	8.5
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	*	*	*	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities	88.2	11.8	0.0	91.2	8.8	0.0

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2008-09)

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting fitness standards for the most recent testing period. Detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state levels, may be found on the CDE [Physical Fitness Testing \(PFT\)](#) Web page. Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or

privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Healthy Fitness Zones		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	8.1	29.7	56.2

X. Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE [Academic Performance Index \(API\)](#) Web page.

Academic Performance Index Ranks – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from one to ten. A statewide rank of one means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of ten means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state. The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of one means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of ten means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2006	2007	2008
Statewide	2	1	2
Similar Schools	5	4	6

- "N/A" means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.
- "B" means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools participating in the ASAM do not currently receive growth, target information, or statewide or similar schools rankings on this report in recognition of their markedly different educational missions and populations served. ASAM schools are covered under the Alternative Accountability system as required by Education Code Section 52052 and not the API accountability system. However, API information is needed to comply with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Growth, target and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.
- "C" means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks are not applicable to special education schools.
- " * " means this API is calculated for a small school or a small LEA, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid STAR Program test scores included in the API. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted. Similar schools ranks are not calculated for small schools.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API score. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

Group	Actual API Change			Growth API Score
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009
All Students at the School	-22	44	27	659
African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino	-27	50	27	640
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-10	42	28	649
English Learners	-20	46	13	610
Students with Disabilities				

"N/A"

means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

"**"

means this API is calculated for a small school, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program test scores included in the API. The API is asterisked if the school was small either in 2008 or 2009. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted.

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal NCLB Act requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
 Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
 API as an additional indicator
 Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays an indication of whether the school and the district made AYP overall and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP Criteria	School	District
Overall	No	No
Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	No

Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	No
Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	No	No
Percent Proficient - Mathematics	No	No
API	Yes	Yes
Graduation Rate	Yes	Yes

"Yes"
"No"

Met 2009 AYP Criteria
Did not Meet 2009 AYP Criteria

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2009-10)

Schools and districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\)](#) Web page.

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	N/A	7
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	31.8

XI. School Completion and Postsecondary Preparation

Admission Requirements for California Public Universities

University of California

Admission requirements for the University of California (UC) follow guidelines set forth in the Master Plan, which requires that the top one-eighth of the state's high school graduates, as well as those transfer students who have successfully completed specified college work, be eligible for admission to the UC. These requirements are designed to ensure that all eligible students are adequately prepared for University-level work. For general admissions requirements please visit the [General Admissions Information](#) Web page (Outside Source).

California State University

Admission requirements for the California State University (CSU) use three factors to determine eligibility. They are specific high school courses; grades in specified courses and test scores; and graduation from high school. Some campuses have higher standards for particular majors or students who live outside the local campus area. Because of the number of students who apply, a few campuses have higher standards (supplementary admission criteria) for all applicants. Most CSU campuses utilize local admission guarantee policies for students who graduate or transfer from high schools and colleges that are historically served by a CSU campus in that region. For general admissions requirements please visit the [Undergraduate Admission & Requirements](#) Web page (Outside Source).

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate

This table displays the school's one-year dropout and graduation rates for the most recent three-year period for which data are available. For comparison purposes, data are also provided at the district and state levels. Detailed information about dropout rates and graduation rates can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Indicator	School			District			State		
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Dropout Rate (1-year)	3.1	7.5	6.0	7.0	5.1	5.2	3.5	4.4	3.9
Graduation Rate	66.0	67.2	64.3	77.0	76.1	77.6	83.4	80.6	80.2

Completion of High School Graduation Requirements

Students in California public schools must pass both the ELA and mathematics portions of the CAHSEE to receive a high school diploma. For students who began the 2008-09 school year in grade twelve this table displays by student group the percent who met all state and local graduation requirements for grade twelve completion.

Group	Graduating Class of 2009		
	School	District	State
All Students	75	82	N/A
African American	100	80	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	71	N/A
Asian	79	92	N/A
Filipino	89	89	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	71	71	N/A
Pacific Islander	100	89	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	90	89	N/A
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	75	77	N/A
English Learners	50	48	N/A
Students with Disabilities	29	45	N/A

Career Technical Education Programs (School Year 2008-09)

This section provides information about the degree to which pupils are prepared to enter the workforce, including a list of career technical education (CTE) programs offered at the school.

Currently, there are no students participating in a CTE program. Current Freshmen will be introduced to the Fire Science Pathway in 2010-2011.

Career Technical Education Participation (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays information about participation in the school's CTE programs.

Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of the school's pupils participating in CTE	0
Percent of the school's pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	0
Percent of school's CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	0

Courses for University of California and/or California State University Admission (School Year 2007-08)

This table displays, for the most recent year, two measures related to the school's courses that are required for University of California (UC) and/or California State University (CSU) admission. Detailed information about student enrollment in, and completion, of courses required for UC/CSU admission can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
Students Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	63.1
Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	18.5

Advanced Placement Courses (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays for the most recent year the number of Advanced Placement (AP) courses that the school offered by subject and the percent of the school's students enrolled in all AP courses. Detailed information about student enrollment in AP courses can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Subject	Number of AP Courses Offered	Percent of Students In AP Courses
Computer Science		N/A
English	1	N/A
Fine and Performing Arts		N/A
Foreign Language	2	N/A
Mathematics	1	N/A
Science	1	N/A
Social Science		N/A
All courses	5	3.3

XII. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

This section provides information on the annual number of school days dedicated to staff development for the most recent three-year period.

Professional development opportunities for staff members are multifaceted and clearly and consistently linked to the state's standards and the school's core values. Although 2 annual full release days are provided to teachers for professional development, many other opportunities to improve practice occur throughout 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. BTSA 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.

XIII. National Assessment of Educational Progress

National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a nationally representative assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Assessments are conducted periodically in mathematics, reading, science, writing, the arts, civics, economics, geography, and U.S. history. Student scores for reading and mathematics are reported as performance levels (i.e., basic, proficient, and advanced) and the participation of students with disabilities and English language learners is reported based on three levels (identified, excluded, and assessed). Detailed information regarding the NAEP results for each grade, performance level, and participation rate can be found on the [National Assessment of Educational Progress](#) Web page (Outside Source).

Note: Only a sample group of California's schools and districts participate in the NAEP testing cycle. Therefore, students in any particular school or district may not be included in these results. The NAEP reflects state test results and is not reflective of either the LEA or the individual school. Comparisons of student performance on the NAEP and student performance on the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments cannot be made without an understanding of the key differences between the two assessment programs. For example, the NAEP only assesses grades four, eight and twelve and for long-term trends assesses grades nine, thirteen, and seventeen. Additionally, the NAEP only provides state test results for grades four and eight. The California Standards Tests (CSTs) are based on a different set of standards than the NAEP assessments. For example, the NAEP is not aligned with California academic content and achievement standards and, therefore, does not necessarily reflect the curriculum and instruction to which students are exposed in the classroom. The NAEP assesses reading and writing separately, while the CSTs assess English-language arts (ELA), encompassing reading as well as writing conventions, spelling, and grammar. Scores on the CSTs and other assessments are not directly comparable to those on NAEP. The averages and percentages presented are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Finally, the questions students respond to are only a sample of the knowledge and skills covered by the NAEP frameworks. Information on the differences between NAEP and CST can be found on the CDE [National Assessment of Educational Progress \(NAEP\)](#) Web page.

National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results by Grade Level – Aggregated

This table displays the scale scores and achievement levels on the National Assessment of Educational Progress Results for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for grades four and eight

Subject and Grade Level	Average Scale Score		State Percent at Achievement Level		
	State	National	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading 2007, Grade 4	209	220	30	18	5

Reading 2007, Grade 8	251	261	41	20	2
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	232	239	41	25	5
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	270	282	36	18	5

National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results for Students with Disabilities and/or English Language Learners by Grade Level – Aggregated

This table displays the state and national participation rates on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for students with disabilities and/or English language learners for grades four and eight.

Subject and Grade Level	State Participation Rate		National Participation Rate	
	Students With Disabilities	English Language Learners	Students With Disabilities	English Language Learners
Reading 2007, Grade 4	74	93	65	80
Reading 2007, Grade 8	78	92	66	77
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	79	96	84	94
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	85	96	78	92