

Fillmore Elementary

2644 E. Poplar St. • Stockton, CA 95205 • (209) 933-7185 • Grades K-8

Tamara Pronoitis, Principal
tpronoitis@stocktonusd.net



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



Stockton Unified School District

701 North Madison St.
Stockton, CA 95202-1634
(209) 933-7000
www.stocktonusd.net

District Governing Board

Gloria Allen

Andrea Burrise

Kathleen Garcia

Colleen Keenan

Maria Mendez

Angela Phillips

Steve Smith

District Administration

Ms. Julie Penn
Superintendent

Vision

The Fillmore Elementary School community is devoted to providing an effective and rigorous education to all students. We believe that each child is unique and has a special way of learning. We believe that our students can and will learn the skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Fillmore's overall theme for the 14-15 school year is iCAN! Fillmore takes pride in recognizing students for a job well done at our quarterly assemblies which include recognition for Honor Roll, Perfect Attendance, Math Facts, Accelerated Reader, Citizenship and CHARACTER COUNTS! Fillmore has a strong foundation for policies and procedures which ensures the safety of each and every student. The Fillmore staff has high expectations for all students and is committed to creating and maintaining a safe and caring environment in which students can develop to their full potential.

Mission:

Our Fillmore Family is a positive cooperative learning community built on respect and trust with rigorous tenacity for student achievement.

Tamara Pronoitis, PRINCIPAL

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 (209) 933-7185.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kinder.	98
Gr. 1	92
Gr. 2	87
Gr. 3	93
Gr. 4	67
Gr. 5	98
Gr. 6	100
Gr. 7	100
Gr. 8	86
Total	821

SOURCE: California Department of Education

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.1
Asian	3.9
Filipino	0.6
Hispanic or Latino	83.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.4
White	6.5
Two or More Races	0.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	93.2
English Learners	50.1
Students with Disabilities	7.1

SOURCE: California Department of Education

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			
Fillmore Elementary	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	37	33	30
Without Full Credential	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
Stockton Unified School District	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	◆	◆	1472
Without Full Credential	◆	◆	65
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	◆	◆	7

SOURCE: This information is provided by the school district.

◆ no data required.

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Fillmore Elementary	12-13	13-14	14-15
Teachers of English Learners	1	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	1	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	1	0	1

* "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.

SOURCE: This information is provided by the school district.

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	96.23	3.77
Districtwide		
All Schools	96.03	3.97
High-Poverty Schools	95.92	4.08
Low-Poverty Schools	100.00	0.00

* 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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2014-15)

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are what the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more

Textbooks and Instructional Materials

Year and month in which data were collected: September 23, 2014

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0	ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS K-12 Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014
Mathematics The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0	K-8 Math, Algebra I & Geometry Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014
Science The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0	FOSS (Full Option Science System) Adopted in 2007 Earth Science Adopted in 2007 Life Science Adopted in 2007 Physical Science Adopted in 2007
History-Social Science The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0	K-5 Scott Foresman Adopted in 2006 6-8 Glencoe: Discovering Our Past Adopted in 2006

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Our school site has classrooms, a multipurpose room, a library and an administration building. We have several portable class rooms to accommodate increased enrollment. The custodial team does a great job at keeping the grounds clean and well manicured. Classrooms, buildings and restrooms are cleaned daily.

District maintenance staff ensures that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order process is used to ensure efficient service and that emergency repairs are given the highest priority.

A scheduled maintenance program is administered by the district to ensure that all classrooms, restrooms, and facilities are well-maintained and in good repair. The principal works daily with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school.

More facts about the condition of our school buildings are available in an online supplement to this report called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. What you will find is an assessment of more than a dozen aspects of our buildings: their structural integrity, electrical systems, heating and ventilation systems, and more. The important purpose of this assessment is to determine if our buildings and grounds are safe and in good repair. If anything needs to be repaired, this assessment identifies it and targets a date by which we commit to make those repairs. The guidelines for this assessment were written by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) and were brought about by the Williams legislation. You can look at the six-page Facilities Inspection Tool used for the assessment on the Web site of the OPSC.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
Year and month in which data were collected: 8/16/2014

System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[X]	[]	[]	
Interior: Interior Surfaces	[]	[]	[X]	P-19: carpet torn , water stains on ceiling tile. P-25: water stains on ceiling tile. P-40: rips on west wall, stain on ceiling tile.
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]	
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[]	[]	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[]	[]	[X]	overall: asphalt on west play ground by drinking fountain is a trip hazard. Site looks good
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);
- The Academic Performance Index; and
- The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study.

CAASPP Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14
Science	26	28	35	35	34	34	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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

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	33	29	31	36	38	37	54	56	55
Math	42	38	36	34	34	34	49	50	50
HSS	36	13	11	26	27	27	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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

API Rank	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Statewide	1	1	1
Similar Schools	4	3	2

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

SOURCE: California Department of Education

Grade Level

Grade Level	2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
5	14.0	26.0	33.0
7	15.3	32.7	28.6

* 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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

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	34	
All Student at the School	35	
Male	36	
Female	35	
Black or African American		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian		
Filipino		
Hispanic or Latino	33	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		
White	45	
Two or More Races		
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	35	
English Learners	19	
Students with Disabilities		
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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

API Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

Group	Actual API Change		
	10-11	11-12	12-13
All Students at the School	58	-26	15
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	53	-27	12
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	58	-25	14
English Learners	54	-42	35
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

SOURCE: California Department of Education

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

Fillmore recognizes that parents and the community play an important role in the success and education of their students. We have established partnerships with community businesses and organizations to increase parent participation. We offer several opportunities and programs to encourage parent involvement.

- After School Programs
- Counseling services when available
- English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC)
- English Language Learner instruction and support (ELD)
- Family Health Centers and programs when and where available
- GATE
- Parent Resource Center
- Parent/Student Academic Conferences
- Parent/Teacher organizations (PTA/PTO/PTC)
- School Readiness Program (ages 0-5)
- School Site Council (SSC)
- Field Trips

The school believes that the parents and guardians can support the learning environment of the school and their students by:

- Monitoring student attendance
- Monitoring completion of student homework
- Monitoring and regulating television viewing
- Participating in the decision making process in school organizations and committees
- Planning and participating in activities at home that support classroom learning
- Volunteering in the classroom

Parents and community members who wish to become a part of the school community and participate should call the school's office in order to obtain the proper paperwork. Finger prints and a valid Tuberculosis test are required.

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

Our school places a strong emphasis on ensuring the safety of all students and staff members. The school's custodial team ensures the school facilities are in compliance with all federal and state health and safety regulations. Each year a deep cleaning process occurs during a close of school, either during the summer or other extended breaks. In the event of a facility plant emergency, the principal notifies appropriate site and district personnel to resolve the emergency and safely secure or evacuate the students, based upon the site and district emergency preparedness plans. A site review with the districts Readiness and Emergency Management Plan (REMS) occurs at the beginning of each year.

A comprehensive School Safety Plan is revised at the beginning of each school year and was recently reviewed by the School Site Council. The plan helps to provide a secure, peaceful and clean environment for the school community. The school's Readiness and Emergency Management Plan identifies procedures to follow during emergencies and natural disasters. Ongoing teacher training takes place on site for several different disastrous scenarios. Emergency drills are conducted on a regular basis.

Every effort is made to ensure students are monitored while on campus throughout the school day. A Campus Safety Assistant, yard supervisors, teachers, site administrators and school staff provide supervision for students before and during school. The playground is safe for all students. All visitors must sign in at the office and receive proper authorization to be on campus, and must display their passes at all times.

Suspensions and Expulsions

School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	4.7	9.7	6.9
Expulsions Rate	0.0	0.0	0.1
District	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	5.2	11.0	10.1
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.0	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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

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		
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts		
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics		
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts		
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics		
Met API Criteria		

SOURCE: California Department of Education

2014-15 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	1998-1999	2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement	Year 5	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	51	
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	87.9	

* 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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	0.0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	1.0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.04
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	.43
Psychologist	.25
Social Worker	.10
Nurse	.20
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.50
Resource Specialist	1.0
Other	2.0
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	

* 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.

SOURCE: This information is provided by the school district.

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
Kinder.	27.8	17	12	1	7	9	4			0		
Gr. 1	31.7	27	23	0	1	3	3	1	3	0	2	
Gr. 2	30	32	23	0		3	3	3	3	0		
Gr. 3	26.3	22	22	1	1	3	2	3	4	1		
Gr. 4	28	20	20	0	2	2	3	1	2	0	2	1
Gr. 5	28	23	20	1	1	3	1	3	3	2		1
Gr. 6	29.3	25	18	0	1	4	3	2	3	0	1	
Other	0			3			0			0		
English	29.6	26		0	3		8	6		3	2	
Math	29.6	28	34	2	1		4	4		2	2	2
Science	32.8	32		0			2	2		2	2	
SS	32.8	32		0			2	2		2	2	

* 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.

SOURCE: California Department of Education

FY 2012-13 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$39,408	\$41,761
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$59,951	\$66,895
Highest Teacher Salary	\$75,526	\$86,565
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$104,770	\$108,011
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$0	\$113,058
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$111,283	\$123,217
Superintendent Salary	\$225,000	\$227,183
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	36	38
Administrative Salaries	5	5

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

SOURCE: California Department of Education

FY 2012-13 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	\$5,677	\$1,748	\$3,929	\$63,752
District	◆	◆	\$4,980	\$61,189
State	◆	◆	\$4,690	\$70,720
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-21.1	4.2
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-16.2	-9.9

SOURCE: Information is provided by the school district and California Department of Education.

◆ no data required.

Types of Services Funded at Fillmore Elementary

The following is a list of Federal and State funded programs that may be available to schools in the district:

- Title I Helping Disadvantaged Students Meet Standards
- Title I Homeless
- Title I Migrant Education
- Title II Improving Teacher Quality
- Title III Limited English Proficient Students
- Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA)
- Extended Day Programs
- English Language Acquisition Program (ELAP)

Professional Development provided for Teachers at Fillmore Elementary

The primary staff development focus was on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Units of Study developed by SUSD teachers through the Rigorous Curriculum Design Process. The content was selected due to the full implementation of the CCSS in California in 2014-2015 and the related CAASP state assessment to be implemented in spring of 2015.

Professional development in the core standards and units of instruction was initially provided through full day off site professional development training sessions. Two full day sessions were provided in 2013-2014 and two are planned for 2014-2015. Additionally, onsite coaching is provided.

On-going teacher support is provided through site-based ELA and Math coaches, staff PLC collaboration meetings, data team meetings.