

Hazelton Elementary

535 W. Jefferson St. • Stockton, CA 95206 • (209) 933-7210 • Grades K-8

Kathryn Byers, Principal
kbyers@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 Statement:

Our Hazelton Family commits to building an environment of excellence and continuous growth as we empower children to be effective critical thinkers and lifelong learners.

Mission Statement:

At Hazelton Elementary, our mission is to cultivate an environment of safety, respect, responsibility and academic excellence to foster a quality education for all of our students empowering them to reach their full potential as responsible members of the greater society.

Kathryn Byers, 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) 933-7210.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kinder.	97
Gr. 1	93
Gr. 2	94
Gr. 3	96
Gr. 4	100
Gr. 5	61
Gr. 6	66
Gr. 7	79
Gr. 8	83
Total	769

SOURCE: California Department of Education

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	8.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.4
Asian	6.0
Filipino	3.8
Hispanic or Latino	78.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.0
White	1.7
Two or More Races	0.8
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	96.0
English Learners	41.4
Students with Disabilities	9.0

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

Hazelton Elementary	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	30	31	28
Without Full Credential	1	2	3
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

Hazelton Elementary	12-13	13-14	14-15
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	3	2	0

* "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc. Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

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	96.43	3.57
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)

Age of buildings

Each school site has classrooms, a multipurpose room, a library and an administration building. The number of classrooms at each school site varies, depending on enrollment and available space. Several sites have portable class rooms to accommodate increased enrollment and to meet the guidelines for Class Size Reduction (CSR).

Maintenance and Repair

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.

Cleaning Process and Schedule

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.

Improvements

In the fall of 2009 the primary playground asphalt was resurfaced to increase safety of the area.

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: 7/22/2014

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Interior: Interior Surfaces	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		B-1,2,3: carpet torn
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Electrical: Electrical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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	36	36	34	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	40	36	32	36	38	37	54	56	55
Math	48	42	33	34	34	34	49	50	50
HSS	34	31	34	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	2	1	1
Similar Schools	6	6	3

* 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	26.7	16.7	23.3
7	20.3	14.9	10.8

* 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	34	
Male	28	
Female	39	
Black or African American		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian		
Filipino		
Hispanic or Latino	32	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		
White		
Two or More Races		
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	34	
English Learners	9	
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	22	-27	-22
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	25	-36	-5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	27	-7	-20
English Learners	35	-42	22
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

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

- After School Programs
- Counseling services English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC)
- English Language Learner instruction and support (ELD)
- Parent/Student conferences when possible
- Parent/Teacher organizations (PTA/PTO/PTC)
- State Pre-Schools
- School Site Council (SSC)

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 at 933-7210.

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 adheres strongly to the Emergency Response Crisis Management (ERCM) preparing staff, students and parents with appropriate instructions, training and practice in how to act and react in case of an emergency. All conceivable actions are taken to ensure the safety and welfare of students and staff. 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 district Internal Evaluation Instrument (IEI) occurs annually.

A Comprehensive School Safety Plan, which was recently reviewed by the School Site Council, helps to provide a secure, peaceful and clean environment for the school community. The school's Disaster Preparedness Plan identifies procedures to follow during emergencies and natural disasters. Emergency drills are conducted on a monthly basis.

Every effort is made to ensure students are monitored while on campus throughout the school day. Yard supervisors, teachers, site administrators and school staff provide supervision for students before and during school. The playground is safe for all students and gates are all closed limiting access to our campus during the school day... 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	8.6	8.8
Expulsions Rate	0.2	0.0	0.0
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	2004-2005	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)	.40
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.04
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.0
Psychologist	.33
Social Worker	.10
Nurse	.20
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1.0
Resource Specialist	1.0
Other	1.8
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.	32.3	19	19	0	5	5	2			1		
Gr. 1	25	20	22	1	2	2	3	3	4	0		
Gr. 2	31	26	22	0	1	2	3	3	4	0		
Gr. 3	28	24	24	0	1	1	2	3	5	0		
Gr. 4	26.5	21	25	0	1	2	2	2	4	0		
Gr. 5	26.5	21	20	1	1	2	1	2	2	0		
Gr. 6	24.5	19	21	1	1	2	3	2	2	0		
Other	0			1			0			0		
English	29.2	30	17	0		2	9	7	1	0	2	
Math	29.6	28	27	0			5	4	2	0		
Science	28.8	30		0			4	2		0		
SS	35.8	30		0			4	4		1	1	

* 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	\$5,518	\$1,579	\$3,939	\$56,431
District	◆	◆	\$4,980	\$61,189
State	◆	◆	\$4,690	\$70,720
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-20.9	-7.8
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-16.0	-20.2

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

◆ no data required.

Types of Services Funded at Hazelton 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 Hazelton 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.